

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Volume XLIV

MAY 1947

Number 4

TYPE-FACSIMILES¹

A. T. HAZEN

TO MANY a scholar the Wise forgeries and their exposure may have seemed a matter of no moment, saddening to rich collectors who had burned their fingers but unrelated to the sober studies of a professor of poetry. But professors do discuss such books as the Reading *Sonnets* and modify their own judgments accordingly, so that in practical criticism it is worth insisting on the inseparability of bibliography from sound criticism, both textual and literary, as well as from biographical investigation. It is not that I uphold bibliographical investigation as an end in itself; I suggest only that faulty bibliography will result in faulty criticism, and that is much more important than the embarrassment which may redound to the scholar. Sometimes, indeed, it is mostly embarrassment and not otherwise significant. Thus, when Professor Krutch in his admirable study of Johnson reproduced what was obviously a page from the second edition but labeled it "A page from the first edition of Johnson's *Dictionary*," no important harm came to his critical judgment, what-

ever pangs of embarrassment he and the Columbia Library may have suffered.

Let me recount another example, however, where faulty bibliographical knowledge has produced very real textual and critical confusion. I have in mind the story of *Solimon and Perseda*, now generally attributed to Thomas Kyd. The different parts of my story will furnish nice illustrations of all the points I wish to make, and from the story we can go on to suggest ways of bibliographical watchfulness that may help to prevent recurrences.

Solimon and Perseda was licensed in 1592, and the first edition was printed without date sometime between 1592 and 1599 by Edward Allde for Edward White. It is now exceedingly rare. In 1599, Allde reprinted the play; a number of copies of this edition have a slight variant on the title-page, a variant that has added some bibliographical confusion but is not important to our story now. Early in the nineteenth century John Smeeton reprinted the edition of 1599 in facsimile, a facsimile so skilful that it has caused the troubles I am about to speak of, although I shall go on to point out how readily it can be identified by the simplest bibliographical principles. Smeeton's facsimile has his name on the verso of the title-page

¹ A paper read at the English Institute at Columbia in September, 1946, as one of a series of papers on the identification of forgeries. In October, 1946, at a meeting of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Mr. Jackson, of Harvard, read a paper on the same topic and used some of the same examples; but our parallelism was entirely unrehearsed.

and below the colophon in many copies; but in both places the name is so low on the page that it can readily be trimmed off. In a good many copies—what proportion I cannot determine—the name has been trimmed off, if it was ever present.

There has never been any secret about Smeeton's facsimile; it is recorded in Lowndes (though not in the first edition) and in Hazlitt, and one would think such records would have put scholars on their guard. But the British Museum, which owned both issues of 1599 as well as the undated first edition, listed two copies of Smeeton's facsimile as another original edition; they were so accepted both in the General Catalogue of 1882 and in the special catalogue of early English books, published in 1884. In 1900, W. W. Greg, the most precise and skilful of British bibliographers, examined the British Museum's copies and included the Smeeton facsimile as a genuine 1599 edition in his important *List of English plays*.

In 1901 the Clarendon Press published the fine edition of Kyd by Professor Boas, an edition prepared with such good judgment and such accurate collation that it has never been superseded. Boas collated all the British Museum copies carefully and noted that what we know to be the Smeeton facsimile contained some variant readings and was printed in a larger type; he listed the variants soberly and carefully but said nothing more about the type.

Then Greg discovered his error, or rather, as he says, Professor Schick pointed it out to him. In the *Modern language quarterly* for December, 1901, Greg published a severe review of Boas, in which he admitted his error about the Smeeton facsimile of *Solimon and Perseda*. In at least partial extenuation he says in the review that the British Museum had catalogued its copies as genuine and that he had failed

to suspect them; but he thinks anybody collating the text page by page ought to see that the type is too regular for Elizabethan printing, and so he does not spare Boas. Yet he makes no suggestion that he has identified the type in any exact way beyond his general feeling that it does not look Elizabethan. In a paper read at the Bibliographical Society at about the same time, Greg likewise apologized for his error, and he made a suitable correction in his *List of masques* in January, 1902. At about this time the British Museum corrected its cataloguing to indicate that two copies were Smeeton facsimiles and not another edition of 1599.

After such a series of blunders, it might seem that scholars would keep watch of Lowndes and Hazlitt, since both books, despite their many errors, have so many useful warnings. But in 1912, in his "Tudor facsimile texts," John Stephen Farmer published a very handsome edition in collotype. He said in his preface that he was reproducing the best and clearest of the four copies of the 1599 edition in the British Museum; in fact, he confused the genuine copies with the facsimile, and he reproduced—the Smeeton facsimile! In March, 1913, Greg wrote an angry letter to the *Athenaeum* about the Farmer texts, in which he dwelt on this error and once again publicized his own lapse of 1900.

One might suppose that the story of confusion was finished. How many individuals or libraries may have been deceived in succeeding years I have no way of knowing, but at least the facts were on record. In 1939, Greg published his *Bibliography of the English printed drama*, with a correct description of the genuine editions. In a short note in small type he called attention to the reprint by Smeeton and said it had often been mistaken for the original; but he did not say that he

himself had so mistaken it, and he did not give any stigmata by which it could be differentiated from the genuine original. Somewhat similarly in the *Pforzheimer Catalogue* there is a note, I suppose by Jackson: "With the double check of the Boas variant readings and the Farmer facsimile, there is now no need for confusion between the Smeeton facsimile and the original, especially as, once warned, the type and paper of the facsimile betray its date."

It all sounds as if that particular problem has been thoroughly settled. Let me not be thought to be satisfying any personal animosities when I now class the University of Chicago Library with Greg in his earlier, unredeemed state. In 1937 the University of Chicago cataloguer was presented with two copies of the Smeeton facsimile: one copy had Smeeton's name and was, of course, catalogued correctly as the nineteenth-century facsimile; the other copy lacked Smeeton's name. This copy was among Professor F. I. Carpenter's fine early English books, and it looks quite battered enough to be a rare survivor of an earlier age that had paid no attention to the preservation of Elizabethan quartos; indeed, some nineteenth-century binder has remargined some of the battered leaves. I do not know that Carpenter, like Boas, was deceived by the facsimile, but he certainly did not mark the volume as being a reproduction. What could the library do? It had available, as Jackson says, the Boas variant readings and the Farmer facsimile; furthermore, it had a copy known to be a Smeeton facsimile, but it had no copy of the original. On the back of the official card the library placed a penciled note of dubiety, pointing out that this copy looked exactly like the facsimile but adding that the paper seemed to be a little different. But in the public catalogue the book was listed

unhesitatingly as an original, and you will find it so recorded in Bishop's list of American holdings of STC books (1944).

May I repeat that I have no desire to discredit Greg, whom I have never met but whom I revere as one of my masters, or the University of Chicago, which I cherish as my adopted home. But this rather long story may show that the problem continues to recur. Let me now try to suggest how the error could occur and recur. Faulty bibliographical study, of course; but I think I can be much more specific.

First of all, few people in the twentieth century, in the United States at least, have sufficient opportunity to handle Elizabethan rarities. Most of the books are now gathered into great public collections, where they are examined, principally under glass, by an inattentively admiring throng. We have no chance to wander along Fourth Avenue and browse among the Shakespearean quartos tossed into the twenty-five-cent shelf on the sidewalk; and therefore many a professor today has to discuss textual problems without ever having handled an original. It is not to be wondered at if he cannot be relied upon to tell whether the page looks "right" or suspicious. Up to 1800 and even later, I think, Elizabethan printing was about as common in the bookstores of London as Victorian is today; and Hazlitt in 1876 was perhaps correct in thinking that anybody who handled a copy could tell whether it had been printed in 1599 or in 1815. But by 1901, when Greg thought Boas ought to have recognized the facsimile by its "look," such familiarity was no longer possible; and it is clear to me that what Greg needed even then for his own salvation was some more objective test than a vague "look" of regularity in the printing. What I think Greg ought to have recorded in 1901, as a guide

to himself, to Farmer, and to the University of Chicago, to me and to any scholar who may now or hereafter yearn to study the text of Kyd—what he ought to have recorded are the specific differences (I hesitate to use the word “point,” which has fallen so low in bibliographical usage that it often means only a blurred letter)—the specific differences by which anybody can tell which edition is which.

What I have in mind, of course, is that we need to know what to look for in the way of type and paper, particularly. Jackson says the type and paper of the facsimile betray its date, but that is not strictly correct. The type and paper do not betray the date of the facsimile; they betray only that it is not an original. A well-established bibliographical principle is that type and paper seldom or never betray the date but only that the book was not printed at some other date or before a certain date. So far as I am aware, no authority tells us why the facsimile of *Solimon and Perseda* cannot be genuine or, what amounts to the same thing, how we can tell that it is a forgery. Yet it is easy enough to do so. It happens that I have never handled an original of the play, but I judge from the descriptions that it is printed as an octavo in half-sheets, a less usual format in 1599 than in the middle of the eighteenth century; the type is Alde's regular stock. But I can specify more exactly about the facsimile: it is printed as a normal quarto on unwatermarked paper of poor quality, that was probably manufactured not earlier than 1750. The type is a somewhat worn but unmistakable Caslon, and it is this Caslon type that will prove (or ought to prove) to any scholar at a glance that the book is a reprint. The scholar must examine paper and type, in other words, and determine whether they are suitable for the supposed date. But that is not the whole lesson. Let me men-

tion a few more examples of the extent to which such books confuse scholars, collectors, and librarians before I proceed to discuss methods of protection.

A simple example is Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651). A type-facsimile was printed in 1680 with the original date on the title-page, a facsimile that is recorded in Lowndes, just as *Solimon and Perseda* is. The only trouble is that Lowndes does not tell how to differentiate them. The Library of Congress has catalogued the facsimile as an original, even calling attention on the card to a variant, without knowing that its copy was the reprint. When Macdonald completes his projected bibliography of Hobbes, the differences between the two printings will be recorded more accessibly, with an indication, I hope, of the differences between the two papers and the differences in type. Another famous example is the 1527 Giunta Boccaccio, reprinted in type-facsimile in 1729. The typographical differences between these editions have been on record for many years, and the paper is another clear means of differentiation; yet I have seen the facsimile offered as a 1527 original twice in the last six months, once by an American auction-house and once by one of the more scholarly London dealers.

Another example is Thomas Coryate's *Letter to the English wits* (1616); it was reprinted about 1815 with the original date, and the reprint is recorded in both editions of Lowndes. The British Museum catalogued it as original in 1884 but has since corrected its entry, I believe. Nevertheless, the late A. Edward Newton paid \$465 for a first-rate copy of the reprint, thinking it to be an original; in his sale in 1941 it was catalogued as original, but at least some dealers suspected it, so that a less suspicious and less experienced dealer got what he thought was a bargain by paying \$65 for a book that is properly

worth about \$10. (I recently paid \$10 for a copy—a fine one bound with other reprints—but I have seen the Coryate reprint offered for \$30 and \$45 in the past year.) The prices are unimportant, except as I shall mention in a moment the usefulness of watching relative prices; I merely quote the prices on Coryate to point out that for libraries and collectors the problem is not merely one of text. Columbia's copy of Coryate, by the way, is catalogued as an original.

A new impression from an engraved plate is not strictly a facsimile, but the rage for type-facsimiles extended to copies of rare engravings, and such copies are constantly being passed as originals. Thus James Caulfield says of the engraved portrait of Richard Head:

Head used to sell for 7/6, but the book from which it comes (*The English Rogue*) is now very scarce, and the portrait seldom to be met with. I copied it for my *Remarkable Persons* [1794], and permitted a young man to have several impressions taken off on old paper, which he imposed on several persons for original prints, though he told me it was to put them before some copies of the work [that] he had by him.²

Thus far Caulfield. It is clear that for engravings the principle of detection remains the same: to record the paper used and any marks of differentiation in the engraving itself.

The problems in books and engravings such as these are not subjects for intricate laboratory examination, chemical analysis of the content of the paper, or measurement. Anybody who sees the original and the facsimile side by side can tell the difference. When I listed in the *Library* two years ago some facsimiles by John Sturt, I pointed out that, although they had deceived all the major libraries (British Mu-

seum, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, Newberry—and I looked no further), they were readily identifiable when one's suspicions had been aroused; and Macdonald in a recent brief comment on my list says: "They should not take in any experienced person who looks at them with care." Similarly, Jackson says concerning *Solimon and Perseda*: "With the double check of the Boas variant readings and the Farmer facsimile, there is now no need for confusion." Do not think I am now blaming the libraries: their major responsibility is to have each book represented in the card catalogue, not to watch for variants or facsimiles. And the scholar's task is to look at the books themselves, not to report how they are catalogued.

But the problem is one of awareness and experience and warning. The statements just quoted assume that the scholar has been warned, that he thinks this particular copy to be a facsimile. It is abundantly clear that, when not warned, good scholars and the largest libraries continue to mistake such facsimiles for originals; they are being offered for sale and bought as originals in this present year. They look "right" to the hurried librarian or to the scholar who is not sufficiently "experienced." As a friend said, when I asked him to examine a copy of the Coryate facsimile for me: "It looks old enough and dirty enough to be original." How is he to know whether he is handling a genuine text when he starts to examine a rare tract? How is he to gain the bibliographical experience that Greg, Jackson, Macdonald, and others take for granted? How, as I was asked last year, is the average scholar (not Greg or Jackson) to acquire the bibliographical skill that will protect him from bibliographical blunders?

The watermarks are always useful and important, and I am perhaps as fully aware of their value as anybody. But I

² Quoted from Caulfield's annotated copy of Granger's *Biographical history in Notes and queries*, 10th ser., VII (March 23, 1907), 224.

have already pointed out that the Smeeton reprint of *Solimon and Perseda* is on unwatermarked paper. Let me repeat the general caution—that the watermark (or marks) will seldom or never give an exact date. It will often prove, however, that a book could not have been printed at a certain time, e.g., a paper with fool's-cap watermark could not have been used in 1600. Almost all facsimilists and forgers have lacked the patience or skill to match the paper exactly; they have relied, instead, only on whatever rather old paper they could secure. Ireland, the Shakespearean forger, to be sure, did buy odd lots of old pot paper, and then, with a mixture of shrewdness and naïveté, he scattered these watermarked leaves among his forged manuscripts. But Ireland was unusual; not even Wise paid any attention to matching the paper of the original exactly, and most nineteenth-century facsimilists were content if they secured some laid paper (with or without watermark) for their editions.

Another constant difficulty, especially with smaller books, is that the watermark is hard to see. But if you can see enough, on one leaf or another, to identify the design, a good deal can be done. It is possible to determine the approximate dates for many watermarks, and certain designs are characteristic of particular countries. Thus the bishop's crozier is limited mostly to German or Swiss paper; "Pro Patria" and "Britannia" and their variants were used only in England and Holland; the bunch of grapes is a French design; Spanish paper is unusual in England in the eighteenth century; and Italian paper was imported only during the early part of the century. But for a book printed in England in the mid-eighteenth century, almost any Dutch or English paper is correct, and so a knowledge of German papers does not help much to

identify a facsimile. Perhaps if more scholars were to mention the watermarks, other scholars could identify facsimiles more readily; but it has never seemed necessary to do so for all books when only one out of thousands has been reprinted in facsimile. It is easy to identify the genuine Baskerville "Virgil" of 1757 by looking for the chain-lines, as soon as we know that the edition of 1757 is about half on laid paper, whereas the facsimile of 1771 is entirely printed on wove paper; but scholars who did not know that difference have accepted the reprint of 1771 as the rare first edition or (as Straus did) as a variant issue of the first edition. So I think it should be with other books: the watermarks of the genuine and the spurious editions should be on record, so that anybody who has occasion to work with the book can look at his copy after reading in his bibliography: "The genuine edition is watermarked with a lily; the reprint [by Kirgate, or Smeeton, or Sturt, or whoever it may be] has a crown and the name of the paper-maker." Such a record, of course, will not deter future forgers, but it will identify at once any known facsimiles.

The watermarks in paper, incidentally, are invaluable in detecting facsimile leaves in otherwise genuine books. The great binders of the nineteenth century were not trying to deceive; they were merely trying to make the book more nearly perfect as a literary specimen, and they never bothered to match the paper exactly, either for facsimile leaves or for repairs to genuine pages. Possibly it is fortunate for us that they did not; and I may observe that any facsimile to be prepared in the future ought always to be printed on modern *watermarked* paper, so that it will not confuse future scholars.

After the paper, the next need is to study the type of any suspected book or

pamphlet. The type will not identify a photographic facsimile, but I am speaking of type-facsimiles. Since the publication of Updike's *Printing types* in 1922, there has been no excuse for complete ignorance of typographic change in different centuries and in different countries. For England the matter was made still easier in 1935, when Berry and Johnson published their *Catalogue of type specimens*. It is now comparatively easy to keep in mind a few differentiating characteristics of the types likely to be involved, without having to bother about the letters that are less distinctive. Thus, for eighteenth-century type, I have found the flat-topped capital *A* and the oblique, pointed serifs of capital *T* to be easy guides to the early Caslon, along with capital *M* and *W*, and italic lower-case *g*; the thin-topped capital *T* of Baskerville will help to identify it, along with its lower-case *w* and italic *g*. Wilson's capital *E*, with its strangely high center stroke, is unmistakable. Fry's type is narrower and tighter than Caslon, although it seems more blocked than Baskerville: capital *M* and lower-case *g* are good letters to examine. After 1800 the Arabic numerals began to be cast without ascenders or descenders, a change that many facsimilists failed to remember.

I mention these identifications not as points to be memorized but merely as indications of the way to handle the matter when such study is called for. The materials are in Updike and in the hundreds of monographs on type faces. But if a few characteristic differences are kept in mind, any book that is wrong can quickly be spotted. The real answer to the identification of a reprint like that of *Solimon and Perseda* is that both paper and type must be right; it may not be easy, at first, to tell just what is wrong, but if one or two letters are wrong or if the watermark is un-

likely for the supposed date, then it is time for a careful scholar to look more carefully.

Another matter to look at is the price. When a very rare Elizabethan pamphlet, especially one of literary importance, is offered nowadays for \$5 or \$10, one should suspect trouble. The trouble may be a missing leaf or two, so that the dealer knows it to be unsalable to fussy collectors, or it may be a reprint that the unsuspecting dealer has himself picked up cheaply because somebody else knew it was not an original. I suppose the dealer who sold Carpenter his copy of *Solimon and Perseda* so cheaply, many years ago, may have done so in good faith; but Carpenter ought to have suspected the genuineness of his bargain. The principle is somewhat like this: if the pamphlet seems about 10 per cent cheaper than usual, it is probably slightly defective, or the dealer lives out in the country; but when the offer is for something like half what the item is worth, it is likely to be a facsimile. Thus the Newton Coryate at \$65 should have made the dealer suspicious, since a good copy (this one was catalogued as immaculate and almost untrimmed) is easily worth \$300-\$400; perhaps some collector, in Hollywood or elsewhere, is now treasuring that pamphlet and thinking that he was lucky to get it for a mere \$100 or \$150. There is a wide price range among genuine copies of such pamphlets; but when the price drops below the minimum, the buyer should beware. The Yale library bought what it thought was a very rare seventeenth-century tract, a few years ago, for the bargain price of \$35; during the depression that would not have been an unbelievable price in a collection of tracts from a small provincial English bookseller, but the dealer was an expensive New York man, and his price for a genuine copy would have been nearer \$135. What Yale bought was, in fact, a

Sturt facsimile, textually worthless and worth at most \$10 as a curiosity.

One other matter I ought to speak of is condition, even though Carpenter's copy of *Solimon and Perseda* contradicts the principle. The general principle is this: unusually fine condition may mean forgery. That, you will see at once, is a dangerous generalization, but I think it is valid when applied with understanding. In general, a binder gives loving care to repairs on the margins only to originals; the type facsimile seldom needs repairing, and no binder would undertake the work unless he was himself badly deceived. His reason is not wholly aesthetic; the profit on the forgery can hardly be more than a few shillings a copy, and, although copies can be printed for less than a shilling each, the individual leaves cannot be repaired in each copy without very considerable expense. So the type-facsimilist may choose dirty paper but seldom paper with seriously defective edges. I feel reasonably certain that Carpenter's copy of *Solimon* must have been supposed by somebody in the late nineteenth century to be original and hence worth careful repairing.

A better example is Newton's copy of *Coryate*; the cataloguer in 1941 boasted of its fine condition and its unusually large measurements. This paper is foolscap, larger than any ordinarily used for such a pamphlet in 1616; and, of course, any such pamphlet would almost certainly have been cut down through its three hundred years, since it could have survived at all only by being bound with other tracts in a volume. So beware of the very fine large and clean copy of an old pamphlet; but remember that the reverse is not necessarily true: a dirty old pamphlet is not proved genuine by its disreputable condition.

Bindings are worth watching, as well as rebindings: an 1850 binding of an Eliza-

bethan tract means that it was collected and valued in 1850 or else that it is a facsimile. If genuine, it is probably a fine binding; if the owner knew it to be a facsimile, he probably had it put into an inexpensive Roxburghe binding.

One extension of the practice is worth explaining at the end, because by its differences it may help to make the matter clear. Buxton Forman and then Wise, in preparing type-facsimiles of Shelley rarities, were following the tradition I have been describing; and, so long as the title-page (not the wrapper only) made it clear that the pamphlet was a reprint of a rarity, no one can object, beyond complaining that it was a little unfair to make such important books expensive by limiting the size of the edition. But when they printed thirty copies and encouraged collectors to think the edition had been limited to five or ten copies, they were getting close to forgery, even if Wise thought it was not dishonest. Then, about 1893, Wise printed a type-facsimile of *Alaric at Rome* but left the reprint notice out of some copies so that they could be sold as originals. At this point in his progress down the primrose path (I am guessing a little), he was doing just what Sturt and Smeeton had done in 1815: they printed type-facsimiles, but they omitted the notice of reprinting from some copies. No doubt if they had been exposed at once, they would have insisted that they were scholarly antiquarian publishers who were helping to make rare old tracts available. Perhaps it would have been difficult to prove that Sturt or Smeeton in 1815 (or Wise before 1890, for that matter) had ever offered their facsimiles for sale as originals. Indeed, they could easily have sold them in the innocent-seeming way a rascal in London used to palm off fakes a generation ago—by bringing out a copy of the pamphlet and letting a purchaser sell himself,

so that no assertion by the dealer was ever necessary.

But then Wise changed the formula. I have no doubt that he, with or without Forman's help, perceived the severe limitations under which he would have to work if he stuck to type-facsimiles. For one thing, the market is somewhat limited, and every collector who acquires a copy of the original is immediately eliminated as a potential customer for the forgery. More important, whenever anybody compares original and forgery, discovery is bound to follow, so that the game is then up on that pamphlet, unless, indeed, as president of the Bibliographical Society you can drown out the complaints of the doubters. That is to say, moneymaking by dealings in type-facsimiles is slow, limited in its possibilities, and excessively dangerous. The great innovation that Wise made, obvious though it seems now, was almost a pioneering effort in printing: he began to print type-facsimiles of nonexistent originals, that is, of what he imagined the original would have looked like had it been printed by its author at the time Wise pretended it had been printed. This interesting modification of the type-facsimile routine offered two great advantages: (1) the potential sale was limited only by the total number of collectors,

since nobody could own the original; (2) there was now no danger that anybody would compare Wise's facsimile with an original, since the original had never existed. It was therefore necessary for bibliographers to develop new techniques to identify the forgeries (as Carter and Polard did so brilliantly), since the customary method of comparison was no longer valid.

One risk that Wise took has never ceased to astonish me: he printed pieces by still living authors, who were always likely to be asked about the "trial" editions he was circulating. At least twice his daring or his carelessness about this put him into a tight fix, but he was buttressed by his reputation and managed to squeeze through until 1934.

But Wise's handiwork is a refinement beyond the plan of this paper. I am interested in pointing out that the average type-facsimile produced before Wise's time can readily be identified, once he is on guard, by any careful scholar without technical equipment. I know that the procedures I have outlined will warn future forgers to be more careful in their selection of paper and type, but I am more concerned about present scholars than about future forgers.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE THEMES OF "THE HANDSOME COWARD" AND OF "THE HANDSOME UNKNOWN" IN MERAUGIS DE PORTLESQUEZ

ALFRED ADLER

IN A recent discussion of the theme of the Handsome Coward in Arthurian romance, E. Brugger has shown the close relationship which exists between this theme and that of the Handsome Unknown.¹ A *Biaus Coarz* is often a *Biaus Desconëus* and vice versa. Many an Arthurian hero, removed by a *fée* from the scene of his ancestral home, spends his childhood in the abode of the *fée*, his foster-mother, uninformed about his origin and whereabouts until the day when he has accomplished the deed prescribed for him by her. Until that day he remains a *Desconëus*. In view of the circumstance that the *fée*'s abode is a land of women, the handsome fosterling lacks manly training. When he embarks upon his first adventures, his latent heroism fails to manifest itself in the beginning. Thus, before his acquaintance with examples of knightly prowess, the *Biaus Desconëus* often behaves like a coward, a *Biaus Coarz*. A diagnosis as to whether or not an Arthurian hero is a *Desconëus*, a *Coarz*, or both will therefore be based on data concerning his childhood experiences, the *enfances*. *Meraugis de Portlesquez*, a romance which Brugger lists among the relatively earlier versions of the *Desconëus* story,² contains no literal reference to the hero's *enfances*.³ Proposing here to show that the *enfances* of Meraugis are not lacking, but displaced, and that the *enfances* can be reconstructed by tracing in the romance the theme of the Handsome

Coward, we hope to establish some evidence needed to outline the *Gestalt* of Meraugis as that of a *Biaus Coarz Desconëus*.

The motif of the Handsome Coward has been reconstructed by Brugger on the basis of two episodes, one in *Perlesvaus* (P),⁴ one in the continuation of the Percival story by Manessier (M).⁵ Compared with Brugger's MP,⁶ the common denominator of these two episodes, the episode of Laquis de Lampagrès in *Meraugis* appears to be an analogue to MP,⁷ though closer to P than to M. As in MP, the hero (*Meraugis*) encounters a knight of peculiar, unknighly appearance. "Que cil ... n'avoit Frain ne chevestre n'esperon" (vss. 1698-99). As in MP, the hero asks the knight for the reason of his appearance (vss. 1761 ff.). As in MP, the encountered knight is very handsome and courtly (vss. 1702 ff.). Differently from MP, the knight is not a coward at first. Defeated by Meraugis, however, he reveals his fearfulness and thus acts like the coward in MP. *He admits to being afraid* of going to the tent of the Outredoté, as Meraugis asks him to do, and obeys only with reluctance (vss. 1998 ff.). At the tent he delivers Meraugis' message, *but he does not wish to meet the Outredoté*. Meeting him, finally, against his will, he declines to fight him and offers to lead him to

⁴ *Le haut livre du Graal, Perlesvaus*, ed. W. A. Nitze and T. A. Jenkins (Chicago, 1932), Vol. I, ll. 871, 1349-1415, 2212-18, 4235-47, 5540-5616, 8738-83, 10111-16.

⁵ *Percival le Gallois*, ed. Ch. Potvin (Mons, 1866-71), Vol. VI, vss. 42129-519, 43719-44064. For the Coward Knight in Manessier and in *Perlesvaus*, cf. *Le haut livre du Graal, Perlesvaus*, ed. Nitze and Collaborators (Chicago, 1937), II, 124-33.

⁶ *ZRP*, LXI, 3 ff.

⁷ *Meraugis von Portlesquez*, ed. M. Friedwagner (Halle, 1897), vss. 1685 ff.

¹ E. Brugger, "'Der Schöne Feigling' in der Arthurschen Literatur," *ZRP*, LXI (1941), 1-44, and LXIII (1943), 123-73, 275-328.

² *Ibid.*, LXIII, 171, n. 3.

³ *Ibid.*, "... der Meraugis, wo z.B. die *enfances* des Helden ganz fehlen. Ob die *enfances* des Helden in der Quelle des Meraugis auch das Feigheits-Motiv enthielten, können wir daher nicht wissen."

Meraugis. In a fight between Meraugis and the Outredoté, he, Laquis, would behave like the *Coarz* of MP, an onlooker (vss. 2103 ff.). Forced to fight and defeated by the Outredoté, Laquis is *disfigured*, blinded in one eye (vss. 2131 f.), and thus, from a *Biaus Coarz*, turned into a *Lez*. This development, absent from MP, quite significantly adds to Laquis' character as a *Biaus Coarz*. Already in Chrétien's *Erec*, *li Biaus Coarz* is mentioned right next to *li Lez Hardiz*.⁸ The two were either one and the same person or were closely related to each other in an early Arthurian plot, of which more will be said later.⁹

Present in the episode of Laquis, the motif of the Handsome Coward affects the personality of Meraugis himself. In MP, the *Coarz* is called Perceval's "avoué que je met en mun leu" (*Perlesvaus*, Vol. I, l. 5583). Laquis becomes Meraugis' *avoué* in the fight against the Outredoté. Laquis' *honte* becomes Meraugis' *honte* (vss. 2020 ff., 2552 ff., 2597 ff.). Unlike a coward, Meraugis challenges the absent Outredoté by knocking down the latter's shield. The fact remains, however, that Meraugis does not wait long enough for the arrival of the challenged opponent. Meraugis' departure must be explained. Is it that he, like some of the Grail-seekers, does not wish to stay anywhere longer than one night? Or does his action reflect the undertones of one who, originally a *Coarz*, was not quite ready to face the formidable opponent? This last assumption seems to gain some strength on the ground of a comparison of the episode at the tent in *Meraugis* with one recently discussed as its analogue, episode D of the *Didot Perceval*.¹⁰ The knightly, but rather ineffec-

tive, Hurganet in episode D meets his death at the hand of L'Orgueilleus de la Lande, owner of the tent. Oddly enough, Hurganet dies for a provocation not caused by himself but by an evil dwarf who, undisturbed by Hurganet, had pulled the prop out of the fatal tent. *Hurganet himself had not provoked the owner of the tent*. Meraugis, after having provoked the absent owner, nevertheless had delayed the combat by leaving the tent too early and then had been represented at the tent by the "cowardly" Laquis, whose *honte* becomes Meraugis' *honte*.

The implication that, originally, Meraugis himself was conceived as a *Coarz* at the tent is possible. In view of the circumstance that Meraugis' adventure trip had been caused, in the first place, by his lady's request—her need to see "S'il fet ce qu'a chevalier Afert a fere por s'amie" (vss. 1134–35)—we may ask if his prowess was subject to doubt. The dwarf messenger at Arthur's court speaks several times in cryptic terms of Meraugis' *honte* (vss. 1433 ff., 1539 ff., 2185 ff.). Not less cryptically we are told that this dwarf has saved Meraugis *de grant honte* (vs. 2213). Obscure in the context but significant for its relevance to the theme of the *Biaus Coarz* and the *Lez Hardiz* is the observation that the dwarf has prevented Meraugis from going "ou li hardi sont plus *coart* que lievre, et li *coart* hardi ..." (vss. 2215 ff.).¹¹ It must be inferred that Meraugis is conceived as moving in an area where *Coart* and *Hardi* are very close to each other. The inference will seem less whimsical if we are ready to suspect that, among other

⁸ Kristian von Troyes, *Erec und Enide*, ed. W. Foerster (Halle, 1934), vss. 1696–97. Inasmuch as Laquis is disfigured as a result of a duel in which, though against his will, he had shown prowess, he is a *Lez Hardiz*.

⁹ ZRPb, LXI, 37, n. 1.

¹⁰ Cf. *Meraugis*, vss. 1411–2155, 4444–4644, and *The Didot Perceval*, ed. W. Roach (Philadelphia,

1941), MS E, ll. 253–456; MS D, ll. 220–445. Episode D in the *Didot Perceval*, obviously influenced by Chrétien (*Li Contes del Graal* [*Perceval*], ed. A. Hilka [Halle, 1932], vss. 3431 ff.), is a genuine remnant of Robert de Boron's *Perceval* and may have been known to Raoul de Houdenc, the author of *Meraugis* (cf. Roach, p. 52).

¹¹ Italics added.

traits characteristic for the *Biaus Coarz*, Meraugis shows some traits characteristic for the counterpart of a *Biaus Coarz*—the *Lez Hardiz*.

According to Brugger's analysis, the norm for a paragon of knighthood is to be *biaus* and *hardiz*, the norm for a *villain* is to be *lez* and *coarz*. From the point of view of courtly mentality, *Biaus Coarz* and *Lez Hardiz* are *contradictiones in adiectis*.¹² As a result of unusual circumstances only, there may be cowardice in a *Biaus* or ugliness in a *Hardiz*. The *Biaus* becomes a *Coarz* through unmanly upbringing in a land of women. Properly trained, the *Biaus Coarz* may become a *Biaus Hardiz*, although he may keep his nickname, *als Ehrennamen*. Through the influence of a spell, a *Biaus Hardiz* may become *lez*. Disenchanted, this *Lez Hardiz* is returned to his previous status of a *Biaus Hardiz*. Meraugis is said to be close to the magic circle, *ou li hardi sont plus coart que lievre*, and vice versa. Turned into a *Coarz* in this circle, Meraugis would have been a *Biaus Coarz*, as must be inferred from statements made about his appearance.¹³ Turned into a *Hardiz*, he might have become *lez*, as may be inferred from his later experiences after his combat with the Outredoté. Wounded in the battle and disfigured by his shaved head (vss. 4943–45), Meraugis, then a *Hardiz*, appears so ugly that Lidoine cries out: "Mes tant est lez que je morrai de paor" (vss. 5038–39).¹⁴ She loves him, of course. The expression of her horror is intended to fool Odeliz and Belchis so as to make them believe that she, Lidoine, is not interested in Meraugis. The point is, however, that Lidoine's horror seems well justified to

Odeliz. Clearly, then, Meraugis might have impressed people as *lez*. His "ugliness" is only temporary. His health and, therefore, his normal appearance are restored to him by the loving care of Odeliz. In this respect his "ugliness" may be conceived as a spell (Brugger's theory) and the cure as the rationalization of a disenchantment. The circumstance, however, that he turns into a *Lez* as a result of some rationalized disfigurement can be scored in favor of Nitze's interpretation that the *Biaus Coarz* who begins to develop courage would prove his courage by exposing himself to the risk of receiving disfiguring wounds.¹⁵ In Nitze's as well as in Brugger's conception, Meraugis is a *Lez Hardiz*. He is, then, a *Biaus Coarz*, inasmuch as he appears involved in the circle of transmutable opposites characteristic of the *Biaus Coarz*: *biaus*, *lez*, *coarz*, *hardiz*. Moreover, he is about to go *ou li hardi sont coart*. As a champion of the dwarf messenger at the court of King Amangon, he fights for, and thus identifies himself with, the cause of the dwarf, a creature repeatedly described as *lez* (vss. 1275, 1389) and yet, as if by accident, called *biaus* ("en lui avoit beau bachelier" [vs. 1926]).¹⁶

According to Brugger's theory, any evidence for the theme of the Handsome Coward in *Meraugis* would indicate the presence of the theme of the *enfances* of a Handsome Unknown. The pattern for the *enfances* of a *Desconëus* as developed by Brugger is hypothetical. In *Meraugis* no literal reference is given to the hero's childhood. Some of Meraugis' experiences as an adult, however, though not presented coherently so as to conform to any pat-

¹² ZRPf, LXI, 22 ff. *Li Les Hardiz* is the name of one of the knights referred to by Laquis (cf. *Meraugis*, vs. 1790).

¹³ See vss. 1165–1247 for the impression he makes on Lidoine, and vss. 3344–45.

¹⁴ About Meraugis' "ugliness" see also vss. 4942–43.

¹⁵ Cf. *Perlesvaus*, II, 124 ff.; and even in *The Old French Grail romance Perlesvaus* (Baltimore, 1902), pp. 81 ff.

¹⁶ If Meraugis is a *Biaus Coarz*, Belchis, his antagonist later in the plot, is a *Les Hardiz*. Belchis is *lez*, his ugliness is described very much in detail (vss. 3761–71), he is called *lez* (vs. 3763) so that his surname *Li Lois* (vss. 3761, 3770) must also be assumed to mean *lez*. He is also *moult hardiz* (vs. 3772).

tern, can be shown to have some bearing on Brugger's hypothetical *enfances* of a *Desconëus*.¹⁷ We shall see that, in some instances, Meraugis' experiences are analogous not only to those of a *Desconëus* in Brugger's *enfances* but also to those of a *Biaus Coarz*.

The *Desconëus* is often a *Coarz* because of his upbringing by a *fée*, away from men, in a women's land.¹⁸ In this connection we may point at Meraugis' adventure on the *Isle sanz non*. The adventure on the *Isle* should be studied in its relations to episodes of the *Joie de la cort* type. For our present need, however, we must stress the fact that the *Isle* and the *Cité sanz non* appear as a women's land. In a chorus, women express their joy over the impending battle (vss. 2968 ff.), Meraugis' fight with Gauvain, the prisoner of the *dame* of the *Isle*. His prowess on the *Isle* notwithstanding, Meraugis at first *refuses* violently to be shipped to the *Isle* (vss. 2937 ff.). After his actual fight with Gauvain has taken place, he decides to rescue both himself and Gauvain: he appropriates the attire of the *dame* of the *Isle* by frightening her and her *damoiseles* (the other "inhabitants" of this women's land) and by locking them up (vss. 3305 ff.). Dressed as the *dame*, he looks, at a distance, like the *dame* herself (vss. 3336 ff., 3343 ff.), commands the obedience of all concerned as if he were the *dame* herself, and thus makes the flight a success. The peculiar reason for his success lies in being able to make himself look like the *dame*! Without feeling justified in implying that the author had conceived Meraugis' appearance as effeminate, we may ask if this episode

does not contain the rationalized recollection that, originally, the beauty of a *Coarz* in a women's land may have been womanly. In *Durmart li Gallois*, the romance of a *Biaus Coarz*, the author feels the need to specify that Durmart, though handsome, did not look womanly.¹⁹ Meraugis' behavior on the *Isle sanz non* can be interpreted as a rationalized rebellion of the *fée*'s fostering, who, as a *Coarz*, does not yet resort to only manly ways.

The eagerness of the women on the *Isle* to see Meraugis engage in battle may well reflect the original interest of the fairy foster-mother in the accomplishment of the deed expected by her from her fosterling.²⁰ Meraugis is not ignorant of his name, but he moves in a world *sanz non*, going to the *Cité sanz non* via the *Voie sanz non* (vs. 2796), the road of his choice. According to the original pattern, the *fée* refuses to disclose her fosterling's name before he has accomplished the task set by her.²¹ In *Meraugis*, the *dame* of the *Isle* is not concerned with the hero's name. The mysterious refusal to give him adequate information in a vital matter, not with regard to the hero's name but with regard to his destination, comes from the ladies of the *Esplumëor Merlin*, the inhabitants of another women's land. Though refusing to be explicit, they convey the impression that they are instrumental in directing the hero cryptically toward his task. Like a *Desconëus*, he would logically choose as most fitting for himself the *Voie sanz non* (vss. 2665 ff.).²²

Meraugis' third experience in a women's land takes place in the fairy paradise,

¹⁹ *Durmart le Gallois*, ed. E. Stengel (Tübingen, 1873), vss. 111 ff. For Brugger's discussion of *Durmart*, cf. *ZRPh*, LXIII, 162 ff.

²⁰ *ZRPh*, LXIII, 137.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Originally, the *Isle sanz non* and the *Esplumëor Merlin* may have been conceived as one and the same place, for Gauvain, who is found by Meraugis on the *Isle sanz non*, was said by the dwarf messenger at Arthur's court to be reached by the way of the *Esplumëor Merlin* (cf. vs. 1333).

¹⁷ One obvious indication that the hero is a *Desconëus* is the fact that, although his name had been given in the beginning (vs. 349), from the time of his departure from Arthur's court, that is, from the beginning of his adventure trip, he is called *Li Chevaliers* (vss. 1356, 1366, 1408, 1418, 1430, 1435, 1451, 1460, 1491, 1537, 1562, 1658), and only later does his name occur again (vs. 1665).

¹⁸ Brugger, *ZRPh*, LXIII, 132 ff.

where we find him performing a dance as if under a spell (vss. 3670 ff.). In this garden, literally described as occupied by women only, with *un tot sol chevalier* at a time (vs. 3677), Meraugis, like other *Desconëu* and *Coart*,²³ wastes precious time, *er verliegt sich*. He arrives at this garden as he pursues the Outredoté. But, since it is the garden where hatred is forgotten, he forgets the purpose of his pursuit. Obviously, he has again put himself in a position where *li hardi sont coart*.²⁴

The task set by the fairy foster-mother for her fosterling (the *Coarz*, *Desconëus*) was originally the liberation or disenchantment of her own son (or relative).²⁵ This detail of the pattern is also to be found in *Meraugis*. After his victory over the Outredoté, Meraugis, almost dead, is found by Melianz de Liz, the latter's *amie* Odeliz, and a group of knights, all of whom are on their way to visit Belchis, Melianz' relative. Belchis keeps Lidoine in captivity, urging her to marry his ugly son, Espinogres. Melianz and his group are on their way to assist Belchis in his effort to withstand the siege directed against him by Lidoine's friends, Gervain and her *seneschal* (later also by Gauvain). Odeliz proposes to cure the seriously wounded Meraugis so as to make him, whose name she does not know, a supporter of Belchis' cause (vss. 4705 ff.). As a healer, Odeliz takes the place of the many Arthurian derivatives of Morgain. By mothering the wounded man, she becomes his "foster-mother" (vss. 4736 ff., 4823

ff.). By restoring, that is, "raising," him for a purpose not his own but hers—she "raises" a champion for her friends: Belchis, Melianz, Espinogres—she acts pointedly in terms of Brugger's *Pflegemutter*. In later versions of the *Desconëus*-story, the theme of the *fée*'s task underwent modifications: the *fée*'s son who was to be rescued (or disenchanted) by the *Desconëus* was replaced by an oppressor of the lady whom the *Desconëus* is to free from the clutches of the oppressor.²⁶ In *Meraugis*, the "*fée*'s son" (Odeliz' family) is functioning according to both the earlier and the later versions: Odeliz' friends are to be helped by her "fosterling," the restored Meraugis, and, at the same time, they are the oppressors of Lidoine, the lady to be rescued by the hero Meraugis.

According to the pattern, the *Desconëus* learns his name and origin from the *fée* after he has accomplished the required task.²⁷ Meraugis dwells in Belchis' castle as a *Desconëus*, known to himself but unknown to Belchis and his group. After his victory over Belchis' enemies or, in terms of the pattern, after accomplishing the task set for him by his "fairy foster-mother," Meraugis discloses his name "Je suis Meraugis ..." (vss. 5724, 5726).

Having learned his name and the tragic circumstances of his early childhood, the *Desconëus* embarks upon avenging his father's death or similar matters concerning his own personal background.²⁸ There is nothing in *Meraugis* about *Valerrache*, there is no direct reference to the hero's father. Displaced and indirect, however, the obscure experience at the *Esplumëor*

²³ For types of rationalizations of the experience called *sich verliegen*, cf. Brugger, *ZRP*, LXIII, 165 ff. The hero, who has wasted his time in a state of sloth, usually deplores his thoughtlessness. *Durmart* (vs. 661) tells how the hero on a beautiful spring morning gets to be *pensiu*: "Tot son affaire recorda; Molt li desplaist et desagree La vie que il a menee" vss. 590 ff.). In *Meraugis* (vss. 4352 ff.) the hero's situation is very similar.

²⁴ It cannot be asserted that all the examples for a garden of oblivion are derived from the *Biaus Coarz* story. It is significant, however, that, in our case, the garden is a women's land.

²⁵ *ZRP*, LXIII, 141 ff.

²⁶ "... die Entzauberung der Dame, die in der Haupt-Gruppe der *Desconëu*-Versionen an Stelle der Entzauberung des Feensohnes eingeführt wurde (wobei der ehemalige Verzauberte zum Verzauberer [Bedränger] der Dame gemacht wurde: Vgl. *Mabon Evrain im Guinglain*) . . ." (cf. *ZRP*, LXIII, 141).

²⁷ See *ibid.*, p. 137, with examples of how the revelation of the hero's name was often rationalized or displaced in different manners.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

Merlin may lead us toward relevant data. In episode U of the *Didot Perceval*,²⁹ Merlin is said to withdraw to the *Esplumëor*, never to be seen again. Since Professor Nitze has again raised the question of whether the name "Merlin" may not mean "hawk,"³⁰ G. Paris' suggestion that the *Esplumëor* is a cage or a dark room where falcons would be kept³¹ takes on some significance for Meraugis, who, like Chrétien's Erec, won his bride in a Sparrow Hawk adventure. Metaphorically, Erec is called an *espreviens*.³² Is Meraugis, like Merlin, a "hawk"? On the *Isle sanz non*, Meraugis, ready to dress up like a woman, "a ses armes ostees ... mes se li plot" (vss. 3326 ff.). Is this doffing and donning of the garb a rationalization of what Merlin (a "hawk") would do in his abode?³³ Thinking in terms of a possibility—not more—that Meraugis was conceived as related to Merlin, a quotation from the *Demanda do Santo Graal* may seem significant as a hint toward Meraugis' background: "E sabede que Porlegues era aquele castelo u a madre de Merlim foi morta."³⁴ This hint is all the more interesting because the *Demanda* reports also the *enfances* of Meraugis.³⁵ As in the case of many *Desconëu*, these *enfances* are tragic, and his origin was not revealed to him for a long time and was to be revealed only after the accomplish-

ment of a task.³⁶ Although these *enfances* are perhaps a late addition, they nevertheless reflect a tradition of Meraugis' mysterious, tragic origin, and, taken together with the reference to *Porlegues* as the place where Merlin's mother had died and to the *Esplumëor* Merlin in *Meraugis*, they suggest the question of whether Meraugis (a Sparrow Hawk adventurer) has not been somehow thought of as a *Desconëus*, vaguely associated with Merlin himself and, like other *Desconëu*, expected to return to his fairy abode.³⁷ Because of the association with Merlin, Meraugis' fairy abode could have been interpreted as Merlin's *Esplumëor*. The mistake in MS D 1958 of the *Didot Perceval*, "Morguen" instead of "Merlin," may have been caused by the scribe's doubt as to whether the *Esplumëor* Merlin is the abode of Merlin only, or perhaps also the fairy abode of Morgain.³⁸

In an attempt to show that Meraugis' experiences are analogous in many respects to those of the *Biaus Coarz* and the *Desconëus*, we have thus far confined ourselves to traits acknowledged by Brugger as relevant to the themes in question. Not relevant to the original *Coarz* theme is, according to Brugger,³⁹ the association of the *Coarz* with a Loathly Lady as the two appear associated in Wauchier,⁴⁰ and in episode G of the *Didot Perceval*.⁴¹ Wau-

²⁹ Roach, MS E, ll. 2652-74; MS D, ll. 1958-80.

³⁰ "The *Esplumoir Merlin*," *Speculum*, XVIII (1943), 69-79.

³¹ Cf. Miss J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval* (London, 1906-9), II, 329, n. 2.

³² Erec, vss. 2083 ff.

³³ Belchis, asking Meraugis about the prisoners he has made, uses the language of a bird-catcher: "J'ai bone cage a teus oiseaus" (vs. 5658).

³⁴ *Demanda do Santo Graal*, ed. A. Magne (Rio de Janeiro, 1944), I, 361 (cap. 279).

³⁵ This fact was known to M. Friedwagner, the editor of *Meraugis*, who, quoting from the old edition of the *Demanda* by Reinhardstöttner (F^o 102c ff.), calls this part of the *Demanda* "eine Art *Enfances Meraugis*" (cf. *Meraugis*, Einleitung, pp. lxxxvii ff.). G. Paris (*Hist. litt.*, XXX, 237) thinks that these *enfances* are added rather late.

³⁶ For this portion of the *Demanda* cf. *Meraugis*, pp. lxxxvii ff.

³⁷ *ZRPPh*, LXIII, 141 ff.

³⁸ Arthur C. L. Brown (*Speculum*, XX, 426 ff.), discussing the *Esplumëor* Merlin, compares it with Celtic analogues of a Land of Maidens with only one male inhabitant. The disclosure of cabalistic sources for the *Esplumoir Merlin* by Helen Adolf (*Speculum*, XXI, 173 ff.) is relevant to our discussion in so far as the article confirms the interpretation of the *Esplumoir* as a Bird's Nest. L. A. Paton (*MP*, XLI [1943], 90-95) discusses the relation of Merlin with Picus (the woodpecker), a divinity of Roman tradition.

³⁹ *ZRPPh*, LXI, 11. Brugger (*ibid.*) admits, however, that there was an OFr version of the Loathly Lady tale.

⁴⁰ *Perceval le Gallois*, ed. Ch. Potvin (Mons, 1866-71), Vol. IV, vss. 25378-744.

⁴¹ Roach, MS E, ll. 810-965; MS D, ll. 776-902.

chier's ironical remark that the ugly Rosete later turned into a beauty because she was perhaps *faëe* (vs. 25744) indicates that he must have had some notion of the theme of the Loathly Lady, who, disenchanted, shows her second, radiant self.⁴² The Loathly Lady theme seems to play some role in *Meraugis*. To begin with, Meraugis declares to his rival, Gervain, that he loves Lidoine, *not* for her *beauté* but for her *cortoisie*. "Que l'aim por ce sanz plus, voire, Qu'ele estoit baucenz ou noire ou fauve ... Ja por ce mains ne l'amerioie" (vss. 609-12). Gervain loves her for her *beauté* only. "S'ele ert dëable par dedenz Ou guivre ou fantosme ou serpenz" (vss. 537-38), he would still love her. Realizing the rhetorical nature of such statements, we may tentatively take them *au pied de la lettre* and ask if Meraugis and Gervain are not claiming to love a woman who, potentially, has or may have "two sides" to her personality—a Loathly Lady, rationalized to a high degree?

Lidoine accompanies Meraugis so as to test his valor as an eyewitness (vss. 1380 ff.). In this respect she is not too distant from other lady messengers who lead the hero to his tasks.⁴³ On the trip, Meraugis and Lidoine met the dwarf, formerly the messenger at Arthur's court, who is now having his troubles with a *vieille* (vss. 1448, 1463 ff.), "ugly" inasmuch as age would make her ugly, the one who causes Meraugis to knock down the shield of the Outredoté. The *Gestalt* of a *vieille* reappears as one of the three weeping maidens in the tent, as *la mains bele* of the three (vs. 1946). She leaves the tent, cursed by the other two (vs. 1592), in order to inform the Outredoté of Meraugis' deed (vss. 1953 ff.). Thus Lidoine has the role

of the tester on a courtly level, the *vieille* has the same role on a mythical level, and *Lidoine* takes the place of the *vieille* as the *third of the weeping maidens* (vss. 1618 ff.). Meraugis seems, then, to be accompanied by two "testing" lady messengers, the one perhaps only the "ugly" aspect of the other. Meraugis' claim to love Lidoine, even if she were ugly, might have been literal beyond expectation! Once suspected in the plot, the Loathly Lady theme can now be detected in the episode at Amangon's court. The dwarf messenger tricks Meraugis into "taking his place" as his champion so as to win for him the ugly dwarf lady, who had been formerly requested by, and denied to, the dwarf (vss. 2440 ff.). The fact that the dwarf lady, a fitting spouse, had been denied to the dwarf seems to indicate that there was something special about her. As we have seen, the dwarf is *lez* but also a *bel bachelier*. His eagerness to win the dwarf lady would seem understandable if we assume that she, too, had another aspect to herself and was expected to turn into a disenchanted beauty. The episode of the dwarf lady bears study as being derived from the Loathly Lady story, but with the dwarf cast as the *Biaus Mawés*. The fact that Meraugis acts as the dwarf's champion, however, shows the hero associated with a Loathly Lady.

Summarizing these observations, we may submit that, in the formation of *Meraugis*, two themes have been contributive: the *Biaus Coarz* and the *Desconëus*. As the *Biaus Coarz* in Wauchier and in the *Didot Perceval*, Meraugis seems also to have been associated with a Loathly Lady. The extent to which the use of these themes in *Meraugis* has added to, or detracted from, the aesthetic unity of the romance as a work of art is a question in need of separate treatment.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE

⁴² For two recent discussions of the Loathly Lady theme cf. A. C. L. Brown, *The origin of the Grail legend* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), pp. 210 ff.; and A. K. Coomaraswamy, "On the Loathly Bride," *Speculum*, XX (1945), 391-404.

⁴³ *ZRP*, LXIII, 316 ff.

CHARACTER IN RELATION TO ACTION IN *OTHELLO*

MOODY E. PRIOR

I

THE condition of character in the major tragedies of Shakespeare is never static. There is a reciprocal relationship between character and action, so that the character is continually being revealed by the course of the action and the action, in turn, is continually being restricted and governed by revelations about the character which increase the probability of subsequent episodes. It is for this reason that a *précis* of one of the tragic heroes is so sterile and that the results of the familiar "character analysis" of our schooldays seem to bear so distant and naïve a relationship to the original. Such critical practices appear to be grounded in a view of the drama, implicit in a good deal of criticism since the eighteenth century, that the end of drama is the exposition of character and that all other elements are contributory to this end. Although individual writers have written with sophistication under the force of this conception—for instance, it is at the basis of part of the argument in Johnson's defense of Shakespeare's "irregularities" and of the remarks on Hamlet of Coleridge and Goethe—it has the effect in common practice of isolating character as a kind of static archetype and thus of encouraging oversimplicity of interpretation. The influence of the concept of the tragic flaw, separated in popular usage from its context in the *Poetics*, has been in the same direction: Macbeth's tragic flaw is defined as ambition, Othello's as jealousy, and so on; and all the subtleties of characterization are absorbed in one or another moralistic abstraction.¹

In comedy it is feasible to treat character in this way; and, in fact, in the Jonsonian tradition of comedy the definition of the character in some sort of *précis* is often part of the comic method. The character remains static, and the changing situations in the play afford a variety of settings against which the character may be seen to advantage. In a great many of the social dramas of the realistic school the technique of characterization does not proceed much beyond this point; and it might be conjectured that habits of mind developed through contemplating the characters in modern serious drama have, by the force of analogy, reacted on our view of Shakespeare's tragic characters and further encouraged their reduction to simple outlines and single dimensions.

In the case of the major figures in Shakespearean tragedy, a unilateral summation of isolated qualities does not do justice to our impression of their vividness and complexity or to our impression of unity in their conception. The impression of complexity and vividness arises, in part, from the fact that each significant incident introduces a new element, however small, into our knowledge of the character, which enhances the probability of the episode that follows. The impression of unity arises from the fact that no new factor introduced, no action of the character however surprising, does violence to what is already known about it: "In my

analysis quite clearly: "Under this general flaw ['blindness of heart'] may be gathered the specific flaws of various heroes, for example: 'the wrath of Achilles' in the *Iliad*; the overweening curiosity and presumption of Odysseus in the encounter with the Cyclops; 'Man's first disobedience' in *Paradise Lost*; the jealousy of Othello; the ambition of Macbeth; the rashness of Lear" (*Aristotle on the art of poetry* [New York, 1913], p. 41).

¹ In his amplified version of the *Poetics*, Lane Cooper states the principle underlying this method of [MODERN PHILOLOGY, May, 1947]

beginning is my end." We start out with certain premises about the character which have a bearing on the circumstances which open the play and which introduce the disproportion that initiates the action. Whatever the state of the character at the end, however difficult to reconcile it with the premises which are given at the outset, the connection is made clear through a technique of cumulative revelation and of interrelationship between action and character which renders the conclusion increasingly probable and ultimately inevitable.

Though this technique of characterization is common to all the tragedies, *Othello* serves perhaps better than the others to show the method in clear operation. The play has often been admired as the most perfect of the tragedies in construction, but such a judgment involves the improper implication that the other tragedies are somehow imperfect in construction, although it is quite possible that each is well constructed for its purpose. A good deal of the prevailing conception of excellence in construction, incidentally, is derived from the methods used in the "well-made" tradition of realistic drama. *Othello* is characterized by directness and rapidity of movement in the action, made conspicuous by the absence of some of the opulence and variety of materials which are features of the rest of the tragedies. By virtue of this fact, *Othello* affords a clear illustration of the technical problem.

II

The essential elements of *Othello's* character are brilliantly and unequivocally presented early in the play. Though the opening scene gives an adverse report of the man, the lewd remarks of Iago and the hysterical denunciations of Brabantio serve only to set in relief the magnificence of *Othello*, once he makes his appearance.

Iago does his best to incense him against Brabantio, but *Othello* remains unmoved. When Iago pretends that he was tempted to stab Brabantio, *Othello* replies, "'Tis better as it is" (I, 2, 6).² And when Iago urges the Duke's power and Brabantio's intention to use the utmost rigor of the law, *Othello* is indifferent, secure in the knowledge of his own worth and power:

Let him do his spite.

My services which I have done the signory
Shall outtongue his complaints [I, 2, 17-19].

Moreover, he reveals to Iago the fact of his royal origins and thus clears himself of any possible accusation that he was attempting an advantageous marriage. And, with a self-possession supported by complete honesty, he refuses to heed Iago's advice that he conceal himself from Brabantio and his armed men:

Not I. I must be found.

My parts, my title, and my perfect soul
Shall manifest me rightly [I, 2, 30-32].

He has eloped with Desdemona, but he has no intention of giving his marriage a clandestine air or of escaping the consequences of his act. In the confusion that follows when the guard sent by the senate and Brabantio's men seem on the verge of a fight, *Othello* is the one who takes command of the situation: "Put up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them" (I, 2, 59). It is a remark which in a lesser man would have sounded insolent, but in *Othello* it represents the reaction of a soldier wholly sure of himself and above the haphazard violence of a street brawl:

Were it my cue to fight, I should have known it
Without a prompter [I, 2, 83-84].

All these qualities, specifically detailed in the second scene, underlie the impression of great dignity and candor in *Othello's* speech to the senate, a speech whose

² Citations are given by act, scene, and lines.

very rhetoric, in its simple and beautifully modulated cadences, expresses the honesty and self-possession of the man. The conclusion of the speech carries complete conviction:

She loved me for the dangers I had passed,
And I loved her that she did pity them.
This only is the witchcraft I have used.
Here comes the lady. Let her witness it

[I, 3, 167-70].

There is established, too, in these opening scenes the genuineness and depth of Othello's love. He tells Iago:

But that I love the gentle Desdemona,
I would not my unhoused and free condition
Put into circumscription and confine
For the sea's worth [I, 2, 25-28].

Though these lines also hint that Othello's marriage has altered the habitual order of his old life, the love they reveal is unmarred by uncertainties. When Brabantio, in frustrated spite, tries to drive in the wedge of suspicion—

Look to her, Moor, if thou hast eyes to see,
She has deceived her father, and may thee

[I, 3, 293-94]—

Othello rises above all doubts: "My life upon her faith!" (I, 3, 295). The scene of reunion in Cyprus after they have been separated by a violent storm, demonstrates the tenderness and intensity of Othello's affection:

O my soul's joy!

If after every tempest come such calms,
May the winds blow till they have wakened
death!

And let the labouring bark climb hills of seas
Olympus-high, and duck again as low
As hell's from heaven! If it were now to die,
'Twere now to be most happy; for I fear
My soul hath her content so absolute
That not another comfort like to this
Succeeds in unknown fate [II, 1, 186-95].

I cannot speak enough of this content;
It stops me here; it is too much of joy

[II, 1, 198-99].

It seems almost incredible that from this point the play could proceed to the total destruction of such nobility of spirit and such depth and genuineness of affection. Iago or no Iago, nothing which has appeared so far seems to imply a murder more harrowing and terrible than even the murder of Duncan. In fact, Iago is completely routed in his first assault on this citadel. It is too formidable. He tries to arouse Othello into some resentment against Brabantio and is defeated by Othello's quiet dignity; he tries to cast an unpleasant and furtive shadow on the marriage by advising Othello to conceal himself from Brabantio's wrath and is defeated by Othello's honesty; and he tries to involve him in a discreditable street fight only to be checked by Othello's soldiery and self-possession. Iago's original attempt to undermine Othello by inveigling him into some shameful, petty act which would place the elopement in a false light and disgrace his general with the senate fails because his stratagems in each case engaged Othello's strongest virtues. Before the play can proceed to disaster, these elements of character must be placed in a new light and additional ones introduced.

In this connection the scene in which Cassio is disgraced is of crucial importance, since Othello's behavior here provides the basis for accepting what follows as probable. Cassio, as the second in command, is placed in charge of the island and made responsible for preserving order. Iago succeeds in getting him drunk and maneuvers him into a street brawl with Roderigo, both unforgivable in Cassio under the circumstances.³ Othello, aroused

³ The technique can be observed in miniature in the treatment of Cassio. We know little about him except that Othello selected him from among several candidates to be his lieutenant, and the choice therefore presupposes some degree of capability and virtue on Cassio's part. Yet this presumably exemplary young man becomes drunk and violent on the night of his

by the noise and confusion, appears to take matters in hand. He is appalled at the disorder—"Are we turned Turks . . . ?"—and immediately takes steps to restore quiet:

Silence that dreadful bell! It frights the isle
From her propriety [II, 3, 175-76].

Then he sets out to get the facts. But here he is baffled. Iago is reluctant to tell what he knows, Cassio is tongue-tied, and Montano is too badly wounded to speak. To Othello this is unendurable:

Now, by heaven,
My blood begins my safer guides to rule,
And passion, having my best judgment collied,
Assays to lead the way. If I once stir
Or do but lift this arm, the best of you
Shall sink in my rebuke. Give me to know
How this foul rout began, who set it on;
And he that is approved in this offence,
Though he had twinned with me, both at a
birth,
Shall lose me [II, 3, 204-13].

first serious military responsibility, after promising Othello that he will personally supervise the guard and preserve order (II, 3, 4-6). The preparation for his conduct is made in a brief conversation with Iago, during which Iago talks with lascivious insinuation about Othello and Desdemona. The talk is clearly distasteful to Cassio, and he counters each suggestive phrase of Iago's with a remark which, while it does not contradict what Iago has said, places a more attractive and delicate construction on the matter. Thus, when Iago says of Desdemona, "And I'll warrant her, full of game," Cassio replies, "Indeed, she's a most fresh and delicate creature." He is offended by what Iago says, yet he cannot bring himself to show his disapproval directly, as though not wishing to be a spoil-sport or deficient in the qualities of galeity conventional with young men of his class. And then Iago urges him to drink to the happiness of the couple. Cassio protests that in his position he must not drink and that he does not hold his liquor well, but Iago presses on the vulnerable spot just revealed: "I have a stoop of wine, and here without are a brace of Cyprus gallants." "O, they are our friends. But one cup!" "What, man! 'Tis a night of revels. The gallants desire it." At this point Cassio breaks down—"Where are they?"—and he is lost. Without the few lines which precede the temptation to drink, Cassio's behavior would have seemed monstrous and inexplicable; from the brief conversation which initiates the episode and which seems to have no apparent purpose except perhaps to emphasize Iago's lewd turn of mind, Cassio's conduct is made to appear expected.

Confronted with a monstrous offense against military propriety and with what seems like a wilful design to hold from him the facts on which he can dispose of it justly, Othello's self-possession appears shaken. For a moment we catch a glimpse of the frightful power of his passion, once his blood begins to rule his safer guides; and we realize that if his control is magnificent, it is so—as must always be the case in a man of great powers—because of the great forces it holds in check. His anger is a response not only to an unpardonable affront to his professional ideals of good conduct but also to the bewildering uncertainty concerning the circumstances, which interferes with the exercise of his sense of justice. When he once has the facts, his decision is immediate and unequivocal. Moreover, it is not in response to his anger; it is an act of justice:

Cassio, I love thee;
But never more be officer of mine
[II, 3, 248-49].

The circumstances require a choice between the claims of friendship and those of honor and justice, but Othello, as we might expect, does not hesitate in the choice. Nothing can extenuate the violation of professional conduct on Cassio's part, and Cassio himself—unlike some of the critics of the play—has the sense to realize that that is the case. Cassio may perhaps continue Othello's friend, but in the interest of justice and honor he cannot remain his lieutenant.

III

The probabilities are now established for what is to follow. Othello is again confronted with conduct—this time on the part of Desdemona—which is at variance with his notions of virtue; once again he tries to establish the facts, and once again he tries to mete out justice without refer-

ence to his private feelings. The character, however, does not remain static in this phase of the action, because the circumstances which arise react on it in such a way as to produce a wholly new impression of its potentialities. Othello tries, desperately, to conduct himself in his habitual manner, but the exigencies of the situation work cumulatively against this effort, so that Othello's every act becomes a parody of his true nature and, before the end, contradicts it altogether.

The first disturbance of Othello's equilibrium occurs when Desdemona pleads with him to restore Cassio's lieutenantcy, but, significantly, the disturbance is not produced by jealousy. Iago had already tried to plant the seed of distrust by remarking, "Ha! I like not that" (III, 3, 35), when Cassio stole away "so guilty-like" from Desdemona; but Othello had scarcely noticed Iago's comment, and it is only after jealousy has made its inroads that he remembers the conversation and adds it to his growing distrust. Othello's expression of impatience after Desdemona pleads with him to reinstate his lieutenant—

Prithee no more. Let him come when he will!
I will deny thee nothing [III, 3, 75-76]—

is prompted by other feelings than jealousy. He knows his dismissal of Cassio is right and that any other disposition of the case would be wholly at odds with his experience and integrity as a general, but he finds it impossible to keep separate his notions of abstract justice and his feelings where Desdemona is concerned. She denies that she is requesting a favor—"Why, this is not a boon" (III, 3, 76)—and insists that she is only desirous of his happiness; but he replies again, "I will deny thee nothing" (III, 3, 86). The claims of his new life are interfering with the habitual rightness and order of the old. It is

only because it is a concern of Desdemona's that he can give heed to any suggestion that he reverse his decision about Cassio; yet to act on it would be to effect a break in his citadel of professional honor. It is all terribly disquieting:

Excellent wretch! Perdition catch my soul
But I do love thee! and when I love thee not,
Chaos is come again [III, 3, 90-92].

The paradox, "excellent wretch," expresses Othello's confusion, and the speech as a whole expresses his realization that his love for Desdemona is the new principle of order in his life and that to lose it now is to lose everything.⁴

This sense of disquiet is the soil in which Iago plants the seeds of disintegration, and he essays to make Othello jealous, since, under the circumstances, jealousy must produce "chaos." Yet, although Iago's initial efforts in this direction are rewarding enough, Othello recovers sufficiently to reply to Iago's insinuations in a way wholly worthy of himself:

⁴ The notion of the tragic flaw as it might apply to the tragedies of Shakespeare can be illustrated by this turn in the play. The tragic flaw is related to the action in the sense that it is that aspect of character which determines the disastrous outcome. As long as the character can respond to circumstances in a way which produces virtuous or proper results, it is not properly tragic. Where its choice cannot result in purposive or useful results, where its actions run counter to the needs of the circumstances, it manifests a quality to which the term "tragic flaw" can be applied. At the moment when what the character essentially is proves impotent in making a proper choice in the face of circumstances, the harmonious relation between character and situation is broken, and the turn to misfortune is made. In this interview with Desdemona, Othello finds no resources within himself which enable him to make an immediate and wise choice. He is confronted with a situation which makes demands on him that he cannot meet in his habitual way and still preserve either his happiness or his integrity—those qualities which he believes to be necessary to his moral well-being. He is disturbed, but not simply as he was in the matter of Cassio when only his momentary indignation and his ignorance checked him from acting properly. Here he is unable to determine on a decision which will meet the circumstances fully and at the same time preserve his essential character. The scene marks, therefore, the turning-point of the play.

No! To be once in doubt
Is once to be resolved. Exchange me for a goat
When I shall turn the business of my soul
To such exsufflicate and blown surmises,
Matching thy inference [III, 3, 179-83].

Only the unexpected ugliness of the phrase, "exchange me for a goat"—an expression suggestive of Iago's idiom—reveals the presence of the working poison in this refusal to dwell on unfounded slanderous surmises. Nothing mars the judiciousness and dignity of the conclusion:

No, Iago;
I'll see before I doubt; when I doubt, prove;
And on the proof there is no more but this—
Away at once with love or jealousy
[III, 3, 189-92].

Iago seizes on this cue. He will now show Othello that there is reason to doubt. He discourses with worldly wisdom on the cynical and secret infidelities of fashionable Venetian women, and he observes that Desdemona has already shown a capacity to deceive: "She did deceive her father, marrying you" (III, 3, 206). In an apparently friendly spirit he warns Othello that so far the case does not justify a verdict of guilty:

But I do see y'are moved.
I am to pray you not to strain my speech
To grosser issues nor to larger reach
Than to suspicion [III, 3, 217-20].

But Iago knows that, for Othello, suspicion, because it means uncertainty, is a far worse state than clear proof and that it is best calculated, as the episode of Cassio's dismissal showed, to produce the ascendancy of passion over the "safer guides" and thus to weaken the self-possession and honest judgment which are essential to Othello's nobility. Moreover, the confusion in Othello's mind is complicated by something more than his present ignorance of whether Desdemona is unfaithful or not. In the case of Cassio he

was guided by a whole lifetime of experience in such matters, whereas in the case of Desdemona he cannot appeal to any wisdom within himself. He is impressed by Iago's offhand knowledge about Venetian women—"Dost thou say so?" (III, 3, 205)—and when Iago leaves him he is plunged into doubts and uncertainties: he does not have Iago's wisdom in such matters, he is black, he is a soldier and adventurer lacking the refinements of "soft chamberers," and he is advanced in age (III, 3, 258-77). No longer can he take for granted the simple reality of their love; and the very things which made it possible and which he alluded to with pride to the senate now become sources of anxiety. The force of that love is so great that, when Desdemona appears, the mere sight of her is enough to dispel all doubts:

If she be false, O, then heaven mocks itself!
I'll not believe't [III, 3, 278-79].

But when she leaves, all is confusion again:

O, now forever
Farewell the tranquil mind! farewell content!
Farewell the plumed troop, and the big wars
That make ambition virtue. . . .

Farewell! Othello's occupation's gone!
[III, 3, 347-57.]

The new order is shaken, and it is impossible to return to the old. Chaos is indeed come again.

Even at this late juncture, however, the old Othello asserts himself. It is unworthy of him to nurse his doubts. He will, as he had said, have the facts before he is convinced, and the man who aroused the doubts must supply them:

Villain, be sure thou prove my love a whore!
Be sure of it; give me the ocular proof;
Or by the worth of man's eternal soul,
Thou hadst better have been born a dog
Than answer to my waked wrath
[III, 3, 359-63].

This speech parallels the expression of Othello's anger when he is unable to gather the relevant facts about Cassio's defection. But the similarities only serve to point up the pathetic and disastrous differences in the two instances. For one thing, jealousy is a more consuming passion than anger. Moreover, it was a simple matter to secure the "ocular proof" in the earlier episode, but it is another matter in the case of Desdemona, and Iago takes excellent advantage of the difference:

But how? how satisfied, my lord?

Would you, the supervisor, grossly gape on? Behold her topped? [III, 3, 294-96.]

Direct evidence is practically impossible to obtain; more than that, even the very thought of it is insupportable to Othello. The evidence must be circumstantial. And, that being the case, the accumulation of evidence cannot resolve the mind but can only serve to increase the doubts, arouse the passions, and thus render impossible the hope of evaluating the evidence dispassionately. Iago realizes this. He fabricates Cassio's dream, arousing erotic images in Othello's mind, and then warns him that it was but a dream. Othello is now so far lost in misgivings as to see damaging implications in every clue and regards the report of the dream as "a shrewd doubt"; and Iago, working on this advantage, suggests that each unsupported trifle might be made to fit into a pattern of supporting testimony:

And this may help to thicken other proofs
That do demonstrate thinly [III, 3, 429-30].

It is for this reason that the handkerchief becomes such a crucial issue. It will forge the final link in the chain of circumstantial evidence and thus allow but one possible meaning to the weaker testimony. Iago therefore restrains Othello's impulse to destroy Desdemona at once—it is to his

advantage, in any case, to give Othello's uncertainty more time to increase his frenzy—until he can contrive the final proof. The brilliance of his choice lies in the fact that the handkerchief, being a love token, is not an impersonal item of evidence but is tied so intimately to Othello's feelings that, while it completes the chain of circumstantial evidence, it stimulates further the disorder of his mind which makes evaluation of the evidence difficult. Yet there is a frail hope in the handkerchief for Othello. If Desdemona can produce it, the chain of evidence remains incomplete, and belief in her honesty is still possible. Othello therefore recounts an elaborate tale of the history of the handkerchief, acquired by his mother from an Egyptian, possessing magical properties as a preserver of love, and fraught with terrible consequences if lost.⁵

⁵ Mark Van Doren, in an essay on *Othello* in his interesting volume of critical studies (*Shakespeare* [New York, 1939]), calls attention to Othello's story about the handkerchief as an indication of how thin was the line that separated the primitive barbarian in Othello from the civilized man. This notion of the barbarian Othello with a thin veneer of culture is not uncommon, and a number of examples, from the late eighteenth century on, are quoted by Furness in the Variorum edition of the play. This interpretation seems questionable because, if the barbaric strain in Othello is to be introduced as one of the elements in his character which affect the probabilities of the play, then it should be made to enter conspicuously in the interpretation, and much more than the indirect interpretation of a few passages must be cited to support it. The fact is that everything in the play can be satisfactorily explained without recourse to this idea, and there are details in the treatment of the character which argue against it. If a suggestion of superstition is to be cited against Othello, it should also be noted that it was the cultivated Venetian Brabantio who ran to the senate with charges of witchcraft, toward which Othello showed a dignified aloofness. The violence of Othello's jealousy, which has impressed some critics as typically barbarian, cannot be cited in support of this interpretation. Miss Lily Bess Campbell, in her *Shakespeare's tragic heroes: slaves of passion* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 150-51, quotes from contemporary sources to show that in Shakespeare's time differences in nationality and breeding were regarded as predisposing causes for jealousy and that persons from southern countries were believed to be more susceptible than those from northern countries; but she does not make Othello's conduct a matter of primitive emotions, and the similarities which she shows be-

When Othello's suspicions were first aroused, he had only to see Desdemona to have them dispelled. Now he has heard so much to destroy his faith in her that the question of her guilt or innocence rests on the small trifle of the handkerchief. He must impress upon her the terrible importance of the handkerchief, yet he cannot reveal to her why its recovery is so urgent without destroying its value as evidence. The real purpose of the fantastic story lies in that fact. And the unhappy Desdemona, ignorant of everything except that she does not have the handkerchief and that it has become a momentous matter for Othello, seeks to divert his mind with something else that might interest him for the moment and can think of nothing but the unfortunate Cassio! When Othello next sees her, he treats her as if she were a prostitute and Emilia as if she were a bawd. There is no longer any necessity to talk things over with her. He has seen Bianca throw the handkerchief back at Cassio, and he regards the testimony as complete and the guilt of his wife as proved beyond any question.

Othello has found reason to doubt and then, in his opinion, has put his doubts to the proof. Had he been true to his former self, he would have followed the line of action, he laid out to Iago and would denounce his love and at the same time end his jealousy. But Othello proves unequal to this cleavage. It is not the simple matter of distinguishing between his feelings for Cassio as a friend and Cassio the lieutenant. The friendship might, possibly,

still be retained—in any case it did not mean everything—and the judgment fell within the large scheme of order of his professional life. But he cannot judge Desdemona without destroying their love, and, with that destroyed, he has no order to fall back upon. But, in fact, he cannot destroy it; he finds it impossible to tear out his love for Desdemona even in the extremity of his disillusionment, and he cannot, therefore, rid himself of the torment of his mind. The most pathetic demonstration of his failure to follow the course he had prescribed for himself is his conversation with Iago after the scene in which he sees Cassio with the handkerchief and “knows” that Desdemona is guilty, for it is not rage that consumes him now that suspicion has given way to final “proof” but the pity of it. One by one he recalls her special charms and virtues, and Iago finds it necessary to insist that he must not think of such things any more and that Desdemona is the “worse for all this.” Othello may harden his mind against her, but the thought that he must do so only brings on pain. Conviction in this instance produces not peace and a clear sense of what he must rightly do but only a poignant agony, a conflict of contradictory sentiments: “No, my heart is turned to stone. I strike it, and it hurts my hand” (IV, 2, 93–95). Even at the moment when he prepares to kill his wife, he dwells on her beauty and finds his resolution failing as he contemplates her, more in the spirit of a lover than of a murderer.

It is for this reason that his original plan of action, so characteristic and worthy of the original Othello, becomes impossible. But it is typical of the man that he rationalizes his final action in terms of a quality which is prominent in his nature and is representative of the best that is in him. He comes to regard the murder of his wife as demanded by the

tween Shakespeare's portrayal of jealousy in *Othello* and contemporary analyses of the passion in general indicate that there was nothing peculiarly barbarian about Othello's behavior to the audiences and readers of Shakespeare's time. It is not, in any case, necessary to go outside of Shakespeare to find examples of jealousy equally unreasoning, Leontes being the most striking example; and if he does not go to quite the same lengths as Othello, it should also be noted that *Winter's tale* is not a tragedy.

dictates of justice. He makes an elaborate effort to separate his feelings from the needs of this justice, not only by forcibly stifling the effects of her beauty on him, which almost persuades justice to break her sword (V, 2, 16-17), but also by the calmness he assumes, by giving her the opportunity to pray, and by urging her not to deny the crime so that she might not die perjured and thus turn what he intended as a sacrifice into murder (V, 2, 24-65). But it is not for him to execute "justice" in this case as it was in the affair of Cassio, and, in consequence, what he performs is not justice but revenge. It is thus that the murder is the final step in the destruction of the man. In the circumstances in which he becomes entangled through Iago's machinations, his habitual self-control becomes overwhelmed by the overpowering domination of a vulgar jealousy; his devotion to truth becomes a preoccupation with insinuation and gossip and turns into an unworthy spying on the affairs of others; and his fine sense of justice is transmuted to express itself in a wanton act of vengeance. Under the pressure of events the essential Othello is wholly debased and degraded.

IV

The suicide which concludes the play marks a return to the original Othello and represents the final realization of the probabilities of character developed up to that point. That the murder of Desdemona is an act which does violence to the real Othello is shown in the fact that it does not resolve at once the contradiction in his feelings. When he becomes aware of the finality of the act, he is moved to remorse—"O, insupportable! O heavy hour!" (V, 2, 98), yet as soon as Emilia enters, he denounces Desdemona's guilt and insists that in what he did he proceeded "upon just grounds" (V, 2, 138).

Under Emilia's protests, his error finally dawns on him; but the knowledge of it, though it ends his conflict and division of spirit, leaves him now void of resources. The killing of Desdemona was so alien to his nature that, when he sees it in its proper light, he is no longer himself, since he has destroyed himself in the act. His dignity is gone, and he bemoans his folly; and he who knew his cue to fight without a prompter gives up his sword tamely to the first man who comes to disarm him:

I am not valiant neither

But every puny whipster gets my sword.

But why should honour outlive honesty?

Let it go all [V, 2, 243-46].

The basic virtues having been destroyed, the others, too, are meaningless. No one realizes better than Othello that he is no longer himself. To Lodovico, who comes to apprehend him, he says: "That's he that was Othello. Here I am" (V, 2, 283).

In his consciousness of this fact, however, lies his salvation and his final restoration to greatness. Once again he is confronted with an act that runs counter to his sense of honor and virtue, and this time the culprit is himself. This time, moreover, the facts are again clear and indisputable, and, unhampered by the distortions of passion, he can arrive at a dispassionate awareness of their meaning and act on them with a calm resolution to perform what he knows certainly must be done. His calm is reflected in the rhetoric of the last long speech, which recalls again the rhythms of the speech to the senate, just as his injunction to the men assembled there recalls the self-possession and honesty of his former self:

Speak of me as I am. Nothing extenuate,
Nor set down aught in malice [V, 2, 342-43].

And in the spirit of the old Othello, he passes judgment on himself and metes out the justice which he believes the wrong

deserves. The suicide thus fits into the pattern of probabilities which govern the play and which give to the conventional death of the tragic hero the inevitability of complete necessity.

But the suicide of *Othello* reveals its final meaning in the fact that it is an affirmative act, not an act of negation, as is, for instance, that of Hedda Gabler. It is in the nature of a paradox, but such a paradox as one might expect only in the greatest art, too deeply implicit in the fabric of the play to be recognized as a glossy and facile trick and too deeply involved to be reduced to a formula. But it is a paradox in which the final meaning of the play is revealed, in which all that went before is implied, for by an act of violence *Othello* regains his dignity and tranquility and by an act of destruction he rebuilds his ruined magnificence.

V

If such a reading of *Othello* helps to call attention to the inadequacy of those commonplaces of Shakespearean "character analysis" which reduce character to simple linear proportions and thus destroy the effect of their vitality and complexity and their dynamic relation to the action, it might also serve to bring to notice the limitations of certain more sophisticated and erudite studies founded on historical principles, which in recent years have been a vigorous and enterprising form of Shakespearean scholarship. Historical criticism has been, in part, a reaction against the "subjective" critics of the nineteenth century, whose writings on Shakespeare have at times, as in the case of Coleridge and Goethe, proved more useful in illuminating the critic than in explaining the plays. It has attempted to replace such personal judgments with evidence of the sort that could be verified by the objective tests of scholarship, and thus to remove from criti-

cism the variable of individual sensibility. It has also at times been directed against critics who have approached the plays as though they were life and not works of art. The results have been, in one sense, impressive and useful. They have made available a vast amount of information on the ethical and psychological thought of Shakespeare's day and on the special characteristics of the dramatic art of his times. Such information must necessarily prove very valuable for the serious student of Shakespeare. But in the matter of the critical interpretation of the plays, these studies have not escaped the limitations of oversimplification, in spite of scholarly soundness and useful erudition.

The chief disability of the criticism which stems from such studies is that the complexities of character and action are not explained and resolved in a unified understanding of the play as a whole but are explained away by reference to some historical reconstruction. The critical difficulties may be interpreted as contradictions, forgivable in so great a master as Shakespeare but nevertheless forced upon him by some local circumstance, or they may simply be absorbed in some over-all synthesis of related contemporary elements. The appeal to inconsistency and contradiction is fostered principally by studies of the conventions and devices characteristic of the plays of Shakespeare's day and peculiar to the dramatic art of his times. These studies have tended toward a conception of Elizabethan drama as essentially a theatrical art, sacrificing consistency to momentary excitement through the use of devices taken for granted by dramatist and audience. The Elizabethan playwright could disregard consistency because his audience (The Elizabethan Audience is surely one of the most remarkable as well as convenient myths of the modern critic) never concerned itself

with thinking back over the play as long as it was provided with a sequence of brilliant dramatic moments.⁶ Though frequently such studies are necessarily concerned with the minor Elizabethans, the implications are certainly clear as regards Shakespeare as well (he wrote, after all, for the same Audience), and in point of fact the same principles have been directly applied to Shakespeare. Thus, much of Schücking's criticism of Shakespeare rests upon what he regards as "Shakespeare's supreme interest in the single scene, which all his knowledge of dramatic art cannot induce him to subordinate to the interest of the whole to the extent that is demanded by a later period."⁷ Since this view of the drama of Shakespeare's day renders the question of unity absurd in dramatic terms,⁸ it eliminates as unprofitable the possibility of relating character to a unified action and hence encourages a view of character as static and as attaining complexity only at the expense of consistency relative to the play itself.

Among the critics of the historical school, unity of character is therefore generally seen in relation to some conventional type, and any complexities are explained by reference to diverse characteristics of the type as revealed by numerous examples. For instance, Hamlet is, after

⁶ The most detailed and interesting of these studies is that of Muriel Bradbrook, *Themes and conventions in Elizabethan drama* (Cambridge, 1935). The general influence of this view of Elizabethan drama may be seen in the chapter on "The Elizabethans," in Elizabeth Drew's *Discovering drama* (New York, 1937).

⁷ Levin L. Schücking, *Character problems in Shakespeare's plays* (London, 1922), p. 112. Elsewhere Schücking writes of Hamlet: "Clearly the play's exceptional qualities rest on anything but consistency and method. . . . In fact, it can hardly be maintained that the parts are in any way carefully related to the whole" (*The meaning of Hamlet*, trans. Graham Rawson [London, 1937], p. 64).

⁸ Where unity is insisted upon with this view of Elizabethan drama as the basis, it has to be sought through principles essentially lyrical or through analogies with other arts, notably music (see U. M. Ellis-Fermor, *Jacobean drama* [London, 1936], esp. pp. 30-31, 42-43, 48-49).

all, a fairly late example of a common figure on the Elizabethan stage—an avenger and a Melancholy Man. If his behavior to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, let us say, seems difficult to reconcile with his behavior toward his mother, it is only necessary to note that in both instances he is conforming to different aspects of a well-known and readily recognizable Elizabethan stage character.⁹ In effect, what this method does is to reduce the character to a static précis again, except that, in addition to sharing the disadvantages of the simpler method of compiling the elements of character from the individual play, it reduces the character to a sort of composite précis constructed from the corpus of Elizabethan drama rather than from the individual play of Shakespeare alone and thus tends to bring the unique greatness of Shakespeare's achievement down to the level of mediocrity of his lowliest contemporary. Attempts to overcome this disadvantage by calling attention to the greater degree of variety in Shakespeare's characters or to his "poetry" merely beg the whole question and, by their vagueness, make no provision for a practical critical approach to the individual work.¹⁰

⁹ Schücking, *The meaning of Hamlet*, pp. 30, 62. The method of E. E. Stoll's *Hamlet: an historical and comparative study* ("University of Minnesota studies in language and literature," No. 7 [1919]) is similar to that of Schücking's study, and the results, though differing in detail, are essentially the same in kind. For a critical analysis of the theories of these two critics on Hamlet see A. J. A. Waldock, *Hamlet: a study in critical method* (Cambridge, 1931), esp. pp. 73-75. Other schools of criticism as applied to Hamlet are interestingly analyzed in this work.

¹⁰ Thus Schücking, whose analysis of Hamlet leaves that play a confusion of theatrical fragments, remarks: "How inexhaustible an art, that can offer us so much without being overloaded"; and later: "Yet all blemishes fade before the greatness of Shakespeare's achievement" (*The meaning of Hamlet*, pp. 2, 66). Among others, a further illustration might be cited from E. E. Stoll's *Othello: an historical and comparative study* ("University of Minnesota studies in language and literature," No. 2 [1915]). His analysis of Othello has the effect of making Othello's character a composite of instances of stage behavior explained by

When the basis of understanding of Shakespeare's characters is sought in the ethical and moral speculation and the technical psychology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the results seem, on the whole, more impressive; but in the end the critical insights afforded into Shakespeare are not very different in kind from those already discussed.¹¹ Certain details in Shakespeare's works become clear in a new way, and our conviction of the breadth and exactness of Shakespeare's knowledge of the serious thought of his time is perhaps increased. But the insights in important matters are limited by the method. The behavior of the characters is referred this time to a composite derived from the ethical and psychological writings of the age—a new set of static entities to which the characters are seen to conform, and the plots remain contrivances which make possible the revelation

reference to devices of theatrical art in other plays selected from the whole range of dramatic literature. Analogies are drawn, for instance, from such sources as *Much ado about nothing*, the tragicomedies of Beaumont and Fletcher, and the comedies of Molière, without any consideration of the wholly different nature of these plays and the fact that their devices cannot be compared without distortion to the dramatic means and ends of *Othello*. He concludes his study on a note of admiration, however: "How primitive and unsophisticated it is not to consider Shakespeare only as a dramatist and poet, not to be content with poetry and drama (as we are with mere music in Mozart, mere painting in Rembrandt) and that, too, the poetry and drama, not of Browning and Ibsen, but of his own simple and spacious days?" (*ibid.*, p. 62). It is to the credit of Stoll that he has labored in his criticism the distinction between life and art; but his analyses provide little more than an assemblage of theatrical clichés for the characters and the action of the plays. Consequently, though he affords, at times, penetrating observations on the art of the plays, the general effect is one of disintegration or oversimplicity. On the one hand, he sees the emergence of the original Othello in the rhetoric of the closing speech (*ibid.*, pp. 58–59); on the other, he can find nothing more than the most commonplace theatrical justification for Othello's confusion of feeling following the murder of Desdemona—with analogies drawn from *Philaster*! (*ibid.*, p. 58).

¹¹ Perhaps the best and most illuminating of such studies are those of Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's tragic heroes: slaves of passion*, and Theodore Spencer, *Shakespeare and the nature of man* (New York, 1942).

of the characters.¹² The point may be realized by reference to Professor Lily B. Campbell's *Shakespeare's tragic heroes: slaves of passion*, one of the ablest and most illuminating of such studies. After an interesting account of the ethical and psychological lore of Shakespeare's day and the theories of tragedy which then prevailed, Miss Campbell considers the four great tragedies in the light of these discussions. *Othello*, to consider our type case, is viewed as a tragedy of jealousy—jealousy as it was understood by the Elizabethans; but, though a new insight is given into certain detailed matters—for instance, the significance of Othello's blackness—it is not clear that there is much advance here in our understanding of the character over those simpler analyses which discover Othello's tragic flaw to be jealousy and let the matter rest there. And as Othello's conduct is seen to conform to the commonplaces derived from contemporary treatises, the magnificence of the character seems somehow to have been lost. Yet this magnificence of the character is not an erroneous impression which exact scholarship must show us to be an illusion falsely sustained. Reading the ethical and psychological writers of the Renaissance, one is made aware again and again of their outdated learning, their untenable premises, the quaintness and dogmatism of their commonplaces, in spite of much shrewd observation and wisdom. Seeing or reading the plays of Shakespeare, one is repeatedly impressed by their relevancy, their vitality, their timelessness, in spite of the accumulation of much local matter. The curious effect of such studies is often that the contemporary lore which they present does not illuminate Shakespeare quite so much as

¹² For an attack on the use of Elizabethan psychology in criticism of these plays see Louise Foster, "A caveat for critics against invoking Elizabethan psychology," *PMLA*, LXI (1946), 651–72.

Shakespeare seems to illuminate the learning of his times. His plays demonstrate the core of truth and observation in these old documents by revealing that an imaginative mind could discover in the learning of his times the materials for his brilliant insights, his vivid characters, his profound reflections.

The inference to be drawn at this point is not that such modern studies as have been discussed are irrelevant to our understanding of Shakespeare. They have their value in supplying information that gives exactness of meaning to many lines and that isolates elements which Shakespeare owed to the times in which he lived, so that we may the better understand the stamp of his individual genius. It is when the results of such studies are presented as the proper answer to the essential questions about the plays that their defect in focus becomes clear, for time and again they present us with a Shakespeare we do not recognize. Where our impression has

been that he is not of an age but for all time, they seem to tell us that we can know him only if we consider him of an age; where our impression is that of the remarkable sense of wholeness in his individual works, they appear to tell us that, structurally, all is disordered and inconsistent; where our impression is one of vividness and complexity in his characters, they tend to provide us with lay figures compounded of texts drawn from contemporary treatises and stock figures from popular hack work. Though this effect is often unintentional, it is, nonetheless, unfortunately present, since it encourages, if in a new context, the creation of static archetypes as the basis for the interpretation of character in Shakespeare's tragedies and it discourages a concern for the dynamic relation between character and plot by means of which some of the vitality of the characters may be realized and some of their complexity may be resolved.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

BEN JONSON'S "CENSURE" OF RUTTER'S *SHEPHERDS HOLY-DAY*

FREDA L. TOWNSEND

You looke, my Joseph, I should say
Unto the world, in praise of your *first Play*.

SO WROTE Ben Jonson to his "Deare Sonne, and Right Learned Friend, Master Joseph Rutter" of his *Shepherds holy-day*. And he, who "never was of Truth afear'd," elaborated both on the thoroughness of his examination and on the merit of the play which could stand the test of his careful scrutiny and penetrating judgment:

Now, for mine owne part, and it is but due,
(You have deserv'd it from me), I have read,
And weigh'd your *Play*; untwisted ev'ry thread,
And know the woofe and warpe thereof, can tell
Where it runs round, and even; where so well,
So soft, and smooth it handles, the whole piece,
As it were spun by nature, off the fleece;
This is my censure.¹

"Censure" reflects not only forward upon the recipient but also backward upon the giver. From the always implicit son-master relationship between Jonson and certain of the later dramatists, one may infer both conscious teaching on the part of the one and conscious imitation on the part of the other.² Thus in the specific instance of *The shepherds holy-day*, one may assume that Rutter in composing his play had in mind Jonson's famed dramatic laws and, conversely, that Jonson in

praising the play gave clear indication that the disciple had written a piece acceptable to the lawgiving master. Examination of the structure of *The shepherds holy-day*, then, should yield a twofold reward: (1) it should broaden our knowledge of the form that the pastoral play took in England; and (2) it should throw light on the kind of plot that was likely to earn Jonson's critical commendation. In order to determine just what weight and meaning we have to give here to Jonson's criticism, we shall have to restore both Jonson's praise and Rutter's play to their contexts. The former will involve a rather categorical setting-forth of certain of Jonson's pronouncements on his contemporary dramatists. The latter will involve going to Giambattista Guarini's theory and practice of the pastoral and to John Fletcher's. Fletcher provides for our purposes a natural transition, since he was indebted to the Italian in certain obvious ways and since Ben Jonson had something to say concerning his *Faithfull shepherdesse*.

To judge by such circumstantial evidence as is available to us, there seems to have been no personal reason for Jonson's warm praise of Rutter's pastoral. Jonson and Rutter, it is true, seem to have moved somewhat in the same circles and to have had common acquaintances and perhaps patrons, as may be judged from the latter's dedication of his play to Sir Kenelm Digby and from two of Jonson's occasional poems.³ Jonson also had a connec-

¹ Poem prefixed to *The shepherds holy-day* (London, 1635).

² Rutter seems clearly to imply such discipleship in his poem in the *Jonsonus virbius*:

"But thou art gon, and we like greedy Heires
That snatch the fruit of their dead Fathers cares,
Begin t'enquire what means thou leftst behind
For us pretended Heires unto thy mind.
And my-selfe not the latest gan to looke
And found the Inventory in thy Booke;
A stock for writers to set up withall:
That out of thy full Comedies their small
And slender wits by vexing much thy writ
And their owne braines, may draw good saving wit."

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, MAY, 1947]

³ See "An Epigram, To My Muse, the Lady Digby, on Her Husband, Sir Kenelme Digby," and "Elegie on My Muse, The truly honoured Lady, the Lady VENETIA DIGBY," in *The poems of Ben Jonson*, ed. Bernard Newdigate (Oxford, 1938), pp. 194, 208.

tion of some sort with Rutter's employer, the Earl of Dorset, as may be inferred from the "Epistle to Sacville." Though Rutter was a "son" of Ben, there must have been many others who had equally close ties with the presiding genius of the "Mermaid"—others not so lucky as to win the written praise of the master.

It is also good to remember, in weighing that praise, that strictures outweigh laudations in Ben's writing. Drummond, we know, found him "a contemner and scorner of others"⁴ and was told that Sidney and Guarini did not keep decorum, that Spenser's stanzas pleased him not, that Harrington's translation of Ariosto was of all translations the worst, that Samuel Daniel was no poet, and that Donne for not keeping accent deserved hanging.⁵ Such severity makes his praise, when it does come, the more striking.

Nor, even when given, was his praise lavish or idle. In addition to Rutter, only three dramatists received commendation in print. One was Fletcher, whose *Faithfull shepheardesse*, Jonson said, did not please the audience only because it was too good for them. Another was Shakespeare, and even here the eulogy, which has been declared to be the most discriminating praise not only of the century but also of all succeeding centuries,⁶ has been spoiled for many because Jonson elsewhere conceded that his own love and admiration of the man were "this side of idolatry" and because he believed that sometimes Shakespeare "wanted" that "arte" which would have made him blot some of his lines.⁷ The third was Brome, of whom Jonson (though in an earlier moment of self-pity he called

Brome's plays "sweepings" and compared them contemptuously with his own "meales"⁸), said that he had

justly gained the *Stage*,

By observation of those Comick Lawes

Which I, your Master, first did teach the Age.⁹

It is usually assumed that the comic laws which Ben prided himself on teaching and observing were, in modified though recognizable form, the classical concepts of drama. It thus becomes fair to ask: Is Jonson's praise of *The shepherds holy-day* the praise of a Renaissance classicist for a play constructed according to principles believed to have been set forth by Aristotle? In the case of the pastoral drama, there was no truly classical model, and the kind was never discussed by the Stagirite. But there was, by the Italian, Giambattista Guarini, an attempt to theorize about pastoral tragicomedy and to justify it by demonstrating that the methods used followed naturally from hints in the *Poetics*. By considering Rutter's play in relation to the Guarinian theory of the pastoral, then, we may be able to ascertain two things: (1) whether or not Rutter was primarily imitative, consciously modeling his pastoral after Guarini's *Il Pastor fido*,¹⁰ and (2) the nature of the "laws" that Jonson tried to teach the age—in other words, his own theory of structure.

⁴ "Ode to Himselfe," in *Poems*, ed. Bernard H. Newdigate (Oxford, 1936), p. 292.

⁵ "To My Faithful Servant: and (by His Continu'd Vertue) My Loving Friend: the Author of This World, M. Rich. Brome," prefixed to *The northern lasse* (London, 1632).

¹⁰ Critics other than Jonson have largely ignored Rutter. Those who have labored in the special province of the pastoral drama have, it is true, included him but usually in the most summary of fashions, and the consensus seems to be that *The shepherds holy-day* had a purely conventional plot and was modeled on *Il Pastor fido* (see, e.g., Josephine Laidler, "A history of pastoral drama in England until 1700," *Englische Studien*, XXXV [1905], 230-31; Homer Smith, "Pastoral influence in the English drama," *PMLA*, XII [1897], 423; W. W. Greg, *Pastoral poetry and pastoral drama* [London, 1906], pp. 358-61).

⁴ *Conversations with Drummond* (Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson [Oxford, 1925], I, 151).

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 133-35.

⁶ Hazelton Spencer, *The art and life of William Shakespeare* (New York, 1940), p. 76.

⁷ *Conversations*, I, 133; *Discoveries*, ed. Maurice Castelain (Paris, n.d.), pp. 35-36.

Almost from the first, pastoral tragedy announced itself as a self-consciously original form. Guarini's popular *Il Pastor fido* had been subtitled a "tragicommedia pastorale," and traditionalists had been quick to attack a form unauthorized by Aristotle. To answer his objectors, Guarini wrote the *Compendio della poesia tragicomica*, in which he insisted that tragicomedy, though, indeed, it had no ancient models, was altogether pleasure-giving according to the best principles of dramatic art and was truly in accord with Aristotelian laws: "La poesia mista di parti tragiche e comiche non solo è fatta con le regole d'Aristotile universali, ma ch'ella ad una delle spezie particolari mentovate da lui è tanto simile, che la tragicommedia si può chiamare di lui figliuola legittima, si come abbiám provato ch'è naturale."¹¹

Guarini's proof that the play fitted with what he thought were Aristotelian principles based itself primarily on the emotions aroused, on the instrumental and architectonic ends, and on the style. What is tragicomedy? he asked, and he answered that, were it an entire tragedy added to an entire comedy, it would, indeed, be an unnatural and indefensible mixture. Instead, he declared, taking something from both tragedy and comedy, it transcends them. Tragedy shares with tragicomedy its great persons, though not its great action; its verisimilar, though not its true, plot; its movement, though not its disturbance, of feelings; its peculiar pleasure, though not its sadness; its danger, though not its deaths. With comedy, tragicomedy shares laughter that is not excessive, modest amusement, feigned difficulty, happy reversal, and

comic order. By "order" Guarini seems to have meant "form" or structure; and it is here that his avowed Aristotelianism is most apparent. Though tragicomedy is "mixed," he says, it produces but a "single form."¹² And again: it takes from comedy and tragedy only those things which can coexist in a "single dramatic form."¹³

What Guarini meant by "single form" in tragicomedy is brought out clearly in his treatment of Terence. Terence, he asserted, finding that simple comedy was rather a poor thing and believing that episodes are needed in all stories¹⁴ (though Guarini hastens to add that they are quite out of place in tragedy), added, as in the *Andria*, to the main plot a subordinate one. But the added material is completely dependent on the main action; all four agents are, in fact, indispensable to the working-out of the plot. In short, even he "who has but little understanding of the dramatic art cannot doubt . . . [that] all the difficulties arise because of Pamphilus and Glycerium." Thus the Aristotelian requirement that there be a single subject is not violated, for the "actions . . . are handled and knit together with such art and judgment that the unity of subject is not impaired, and . . . the story is more firmly knotted."¹⁵

On the same grounds Guarini defended his own introduction of several pairs of lovers into *Il Pastor fido*:

Il principal soggetto è quello di Mirtillo e d'Amarilli, che non s'annoderebbe, se non vi concorressero quelle di Corsica e di Silvio. Che altro è quella favola, se non l'amore d'uno infelice amante, col mezzo della fede maravigliosamente fatto felice? Tutti i personaggi, tutti gli episodi, tutti gli oracoli, tutte le pratiche, tutto 'l negozio al segno di Mirtillo

¹¹ *Compendio della poesia tragicomica*, ed. Gioachino Brognoligo ("Scrittori d'Italia" [Bari, 1914]), p. 255. For a partial translation of the *Compendio*, see *Literary criticism, Plato to Dryden*, ed. Allan H. Gilbert (New York, 1940), pp. 504-33.

¹² *Compendio*, p. 232; Gilbert, p. 512.

¹³ *Compendio*, p. 246; Gilbert, p. 524.

¹⁴ *Compendio*, p. 263; Gilbert, p. 528.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

vanno a ferire; tutte le linee di quella favola a quel punto sono indiritte. Chi è nel nodo altri che Mirtillo e Amarilli? Dalla prigionia della quale deriva tutto lo 'ntrigo e poscia lo scioglimento: la fede di Mirtillo si manifesta, l'oracolo si dichiara, la favola si sviluppa e Mirtillo, d'infeliceissimo amante, diventa sposo fortunatissimo. Se l'amor di Corsica (se quello "amore" chiamar si può) non fosse stato, non si sarebbe già mai condotta con l'amante Amarilli nella spelonca, e 'n conseguenza non sarebbe mai stata presa né condannata, né Mirtillo avrebbe occasione avuta di manifestar la sua fede, né si sarebbe interpretato l'oracolo, e, 'nsomma, la favola sarebbe stata un'altra cosa, un'altra faccia diversissima avrebbe avuta.¹⁶

No one would deny the intricacy of the plot of *Il Pastor fido*, and least of all Guarini himself, who was altogether willing that there be "more intrigue and continual enrichment of the subject with new incidents,"¹⁷ so long as unity of action was not sacrificed. Indeed, Symonds' description of the structure is eminently fitting: "Both plot and underplot are so connected in the main action and so interwoven by links of mutual dependency that they form one richly varied fabric."¹⁸ All the action of the play evolves from, and is resolved by, the working-out of the oracle: Amarilli cannot love Mirtillo; Mirtillo, in turn loved by Corsica, can love only Amarilli; Silvio, commanded to love Amarilli, will love no one; Dorinda pines for the love of Silvio; and this tangled affair is put to rights by a single event: Mirtillo is proved to be Silvio.

Guarini's analysis of the structure of his play is the only exposition of its kind from the pen of a Renaissance pastoralist. When the pastoral made its way onto the English stage, the English play-

wrights, characteristically not inclined to theorize in print, merely took over the name of the kind. Yet one may assume, I think, that English writers knew their Guarini, both as a critic and as a playwright. Certainly, John Fletcher's prefatory remarks to his *Faithfull shepherdesse* bear unmistakable resemblance to passages in the *Compendio*. The *faithfull shepherdesse*, moreover, reveals itself as imitative of much in *Il Pastor fido*. In style, in the choice of certain of the characters, in the quality of the mirth and the quality of the pleasure, the English play shares much with the Italian. But when one comes to structure, Fletcher's debt to Guarini, if it exists at all, is much less apparent. Since Fletcher's pastoral, too, earned Jonson's commendation, it seems worth while to glance at its structure before proceeding to an examination of *The shepherds holy-day*.

The faithfull shepherdesse lacks the compelling central situation of *Il Pastor fido*. There is, it is true, a narrative which runs its course; the various situations presented at the beginning are complicated, involved, and then resolved in commendable dramatic fashion. Yet Fletcher's interest does not seem to have been in telling a story.¹⁹ There is, however, a "principal subject," though, again, hardly in the sense that Guarini intended it, for the Italian clearly meant, by "subject," plot; and in Fletcher "subject" becomes a

¹⁹ Cf. "That Fletcher felt the aloofness of the form is evident from the fact that in using it he adopted a treatment distinct in almost every point from that which he followed in his other plays. Not only does he introduce a different metrical scheme, but here, as nowhere else, he subordinates the plot interest to subtler considerations and effects, keeps down his predilection for complications and conventions, except such as will harmonize with the central idea, and even omits much of the plot of his Italian source—the *Pastor Fido*, which, in his search for material, would usually offer a strong appeal to him—all in order that he may obtain a simplicity of impression and a unity of tone" (Orle Latham Hatcher, *John Fletcher: a study in dramatic method* [Chicago, 1905], pp. 30-31).

¹⁶ *Compendio*, p. 265.

¹⁷ *Compendio*, p. 264; Gilbert, p. 529.

¹⁸ J. A. Symonds, *The Renaissance in Italy* (London, 1897-98), IV, 272.

theme, i.e., love, in many transformations and effects. Clorin thus becomes the chief character, the faithful shepherdess,²⁰ in that it is she who represents the highest type on Fletcher's ladder-of-love and who, acting as both conscious agent and unconscious magnet, draws all the other characters. Greg points out that Fletcher possessed "no plot ready to hand capable of determining his characters, but appears to have selected what he considered a suitable variety of types to fill a pastoral stage, not because he desired in any way to be allegorical, but because in such a case it was the abstract relationship among the characters which alone could determine his choice. Having selected his characters, he further seems to have left them free to evolve a plot for themselves, a thing they signally failed to do."²¹ This, perhaps, goes rather far; but, both in the tone of Fletcher's preface and in that of certain of his dramatist friends who wrote commendatory poems to his play, there is a consciousness that artistic, even scholarly, interests were uppermost in the playwright's mind. Chapman hails the play as the product of that rare combination: the scholar and the poet. Beaumont, too, reflects the opinion that the play was above the understanding of the masses.

Yet, whatever doubt there may exist about Fletcher's motives in writing the play, there can be little or no doubt that

²⁰ Cf., however, Greg, who writes: "Certain critics have suggested that the *Pastor Fido* might more appropriately have borne the title of Fletcher's play. This is absurd, since it would mean giving the title-role to the wholly secondary Dorinda. Perhaps they failed to perceive that Mirtillo and not Silvio is the hero. With Fletcher's play the case stands otherwise. There is absolutely nothing to show whether the title refers to the presiding genius of the piece, Clorin, faithful to the memory of the dead, or to the central character, Amoret, faithful in spite of himself to her beloved Perigot. I incline to believe that it is the latter that is the 'faithful shepherdess,' since it might be contended that, in the conventional language of the pastoral, Clorin would be more properly described as the 'constant shepherdess'" (p. 267).

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

the play could not have met Guarini's requirement that the form be single. The plot of *The faithful shepherdess* does not, in any sense, fulfil a requirement for a single action. There are three "love situations" in the play: that of Clorin and Thenot; that of Amoret and Perigot, which is complicated by Amarillis' machinations; and that of Chloe, Daphnis, and Alexis. The first situation can, in part, be discounted as an independent element, since Clorin never takes serious thought of Thenot, disabuses him of his queer fancy almost casually, and is chiefly concerned as the agent for curing Amoret and Daphnis. The other two situations, however, remain almost completely independent of each other, except for the sally of Amarillis' ally, the Sullen Shepherd, into the Chloe-Alexis situation (Act III, scene 1). Beyond this one slight link there is no connection made between the two actions, and there is no dependence of one upon the other.

When we come to Rutter's pastoral, we find no theorizing about the nature of the play. But examination of *The shepherds holy-day* reveals that it fits well with Fletcher's (and Guarini's) description, in that, wanting deaths, it is no tragedy, and yet, since it brings some near it, is no comedy. Further, one may find in it observation of certain other of Guarini's requirements. In it is the proper mingling of near-tragic pleasure with modest amusement, the proper amount of danger with its feigned difficulty and happy reversal. Absent is the punishment, suitable to tragedy but not fitting in tragicomedy.²² In it are commingled the great persons of tragedy and the citizens of comedy, in the

²² "E, come il riso non converrebbe alla doppia costituzione, conciosiacosachè, dov'egli è, non possa stare tragica forma, così il gastigo, che nella doppia a' malfattori si dà, non conviene alla poesia tragicomica, nella quale, secondo 'l costume comico, i peggiori non si gastigano" (*Compendio*, p. 260).

requisite form of "some shepherds [who] are noble and others [who] are not."²³

Thus far, then, Guarini could have found no fault with Rutter's play. But would the same hold true when we come to the Italian's requirement that "le parti regie, private e pastorali producono un sol soggetto"?²⁴ In other words, have we here the fulfilment of Guarini's interpretation of Aristotelian unity of action? The answer must be an unequivocal "No." We do not have "un sol soggetto," we do not have unity of action, because there are in the play two distinct actions, the second being in nowise dependent upon the first. This lack of dependency has been criticized: "In point of dramatic construction the first three acts leave little to be desired; as is so often the case the weakness of the plot appears in the unravelling. The double solution of the two threads, neither of which is properly subordinated, and which are wholly independent, is a serious blot on the dramatic merit of the play."²⁵

One of the two separate plots, that of Thyrsis and Sylvia, concerns the fortunes of a shepherd, who turns out to be of royal blood, and of a shepherdess, who as a princess, though in disguise, had met and loved him. This action, which begins the play, alternates throughout with the other, which concerns the love of Hylas and Daphnis for Nerina, and of Dorinda for Daphnis. Act I, scene 1; Act II, scene 1;

Act III, scenes 1, 2; Act IV, scenes 1, 2, 3; and Act V, scene 4, are devoted to the first action. Act III, scene 3, is devoted to both actions, and the other scenes concern the second action. Neither in complication nor in unraveling are the two actions related; each proceeds without relation to the other.

Yet this is not to say that Rutter has simply put two separate actions into a single play, without taking care to dovetail them. The two actions often complement each other. For example, Thyrsis, mourning for the loss of Sylvia and his vows of eternal constancy in Act I, scene 1, are counterbalanced in Act I, scene 2, by Hylas' similar vows of undying love for Nerina. Euarchus, the dictatorial father in the first plot, has something of a counterpart in Charinus in the second. Mirtillus, the shepherd who takes his loves and ladies lightly, steps between and, here and there, binds together the two actions. It is he who is the recipient of Hylas' sighings in Act I, scene 2, and of Thyrsis' in Act II, scene 1. It is he who brings Thyrsis news that the princess particularly desires his presence (Act II, scene 1), and he it is who makes ironic comments for the amusement of the audience when Hylas breathes forth his passionate avowals to Nerina (Act II, scene 2). It is he, moreover, who, in the closing scenes of the second action (Act V, scene 2), brings Montanus the message from Thyrsis at the court. The two plots further complement each other in the similarity of their subject matter: both deal with the love of a shepherd, in the one case real, and in the other, supposed; both come dangerously near to the deaths, which, as Guarini advanced, provide the compassionate pleasures of tragicomedy.

Yet for all the symmetry in the development of the actions and for all the interweaving done by Mirtillus, the plots re-

²³ "Il 'pastorale' nel *Pastor fido* non si dé' prender per sustantivo significante favola separata dalla tragicommedia, ma per aggiunto di 'tragicommedia,' composta di pastorali persone a differenza di quelle che rappresentano cittadini. Conciosiacosaché la voce 'tragicommedia' ci dimostra la qualità della favola e la voce di 'pastorale' quella delle persone che in essa si rappresentano, le quali, perciocché potevano essere cittadine, volle il poeta che si sapesse ch'eran pastori. E perciocché, di questi, altri son nobili e altri no, questi fanno la comica e quelli fanno la tragica, e ambo insieme la tragicomica, che viene a essere pastorale per le persone in essa rappresentate" (*ibid.*, p. 274).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

²⁵ Greg, p. 360.

main separate. Rutter has made no attempt to approach unity of action—going beyond Fletcher in that there can be discerned in *The shepherds holy-day* no unity of theme. Yet for both plays Jonson had praise. In the poem which prefaces the first edition of *The faithfull shepherdesse* he gives no specific criticism, as he was to do of Rutter's play. He avers stoutly, however, that the public failure of the play was not due to any defects in it, but only to the ignorance of those who came to view it:

The wise, and many-headed *Bench*, that sits
Upon the Life, and Death of *Playes*, and
Wits,
(Compos'd of *Gamester*, *Captaine*, *Knight*,
Knight's man,
Lady, or *Pusil*, that weares maske, or fan,
Velvet, or *Taffeta* cap, rank'd in the darke
With the shops *Foreman*, or some such *brave*
sparke,
That may judge for his *six-pence*) had, before
They saw it halfe, damd thy whole play,
and more,
Their motives were, since it had not to do
With vices, which they look'd for, and
came to.
I, that am glad, thy Innocence was thy Guilt,
And wish that all the *Muses* blood were
spilt,
In such a *Martirdome*; To vex their eyes,
Do crowne thy murdered *Poëme*: which
shall rise
A glorified worke to Time, when Fire,
Or moathes shall eate, what all these Fooles
admire.

Jonson's praise of *The faithfull shepherdesse* was indorsed and rendered more specific by his later assertion to Drummond that "The Fathfull Shipheardesses [was] a Tragicomedie well done."²⁶ His commendatory poem to Fletcher's play is, moreover, somewhat reminiscent of his epilogue to his own *Cynthia's revels*—a play which, like *The faithfull shepherd-*

esse, finds its "principal subject" and its "unity" in a theme rather than in the traditional plot.²⁷ He is here, by implication, then, assuming Fletcher's difference from the usual play on the boards and even from Guarini's own pastoral. Perhaps one may see in the background some theory of the growth of the pastoral, approximating Jonson's theory of the growth of comedy, and so hear his voice saying of pastoral tragicomedy: "I see not then but we should enjoy the same licence, or free power, to illustrate and heighten our invention as they did; and not bee tyed to those strict and regular formes, which the nicenesse of a few (who are nothing but force) would thrust upon us."²⁸

But we need not limit ourselves to finding out by implication Jonson's ideas concerning the pastoral. Though *The sad shepherd* remains unfinished, the prologue to the piece gives evident proof that Jonson took a free, even a heretical, view of the genre:

But here's an Heresie of late let fall:
That Mirth by no meanes fits a Pastorall;
Such say so, who can make none, he presumes:
Else there's no Scene, more properly assumes
The Sock. For whence can sport in kind arise,
But from the Rurall Routs and Families?
Safe on this ground then, wee not feare to day,
To tempt your laughter by our rustick Play.
Wherein if we distaste, or be cry'd downe,
Wee thinke wee therefore shall not leave the
Towne;
Nor that the Fore-wits, that would draw the
rest
Vnto their liking, alwayes like the best.
The wise, and knowing Critick will not say,
This worst, or better is, before he weigh,
Where every piece be perfect in the kind:
And then, though in themselves he difference
find,

²⁷ See Ernest W. Talbert, "Classical mythology and the structure of *Cynthia's revels*," *PQ*, XXII (1943), 193-210.

²⁸ *Every man out of his humour*, Grex after the second sounding, II. 266-70 (Herford and Simpson, III, 437).

²⁶ *Conversations*, I, 138.

Yet if the place require it where they stood,
The equall fitting makes them equall good.
You shall have Love and Hate, and lealousie,
As well as Mirth, and Rage, and Melancholy:
Or whatsoever else may either move,
Or stirre affections, and your likings prove.
But that no stile for Pastorall should goe
Current, but what is stamp'd with *Ah*, and *O*;
Who judgeth so, may singularly erre;
As if all Poesie had one Character.²⁹

From this prologue we can infer a number of things which shed light not only on Jonson's praise of Rutter's multiplex structure but also on the parallel, though less striking, case of Fletcher's departure from Guarini's requirement of unity of action. The prologue to *The sad shepherd* has little in common with Guarini's *Compendio*. Jonson does, of course, agree with Guarini that the emotions of both comedy and tragedy are properly included in the pastoral, but Ben's "Mirth" seems to go much further than Guarini's "laughter that is not excessive" and his "modest amusement." Guarini, we know, spoke of choosing most carefully the comic and tragic elements which would cohere in the single dramatic form. This does not seem to have troubled Jonson at all. He would have all that should to his audience's "likings prove" and would have the world know that many styles, rather than one, were possible within the limits of a single pastoral play.³⁰ Though elsewhere he berated Guarini himself for not keep-

ing decorum, he here extends to the widest possible limit its application in the pastoral. True, he would say, each character should speak the language suitable to his station (all Guarini's characters speak poetically), but "Rurall Routs and Families" call for one kind of speech, and "Love" and "Melancholy" might well require another.³¹ Moreover, whatever merit Jonson would concede to Guarini the playwright, he makes clear that as critic he should have no right to determine general practice in the pastoral play. It was the dramatist not the critic, current practice not theory or tradition, which was to determine the nature of the particular play, pastoral or otherwise.

Certainly, Jonson failed to fulfil Guarini's requirement of unity of action. If the action of the pastoral is a unit, it must first of all be decided *what* that action is. It has been said that Jonson "wove together two threads, pastoral and forest, apparently regarding them as of equal importance and seeing no incongruity in the combination," and that "in general the pastoral incidents serve as an underplot, utterly foreign in spirit to the main plot, yet interwoven in such a way as to show Jonson's skill at its best."³² With this opinion Greg disagrees.

The complication [between Robin Hood and Maid Marian] is completely solved by the end of the second act, and it was obviously introduced for no other purpose than to bring about a general crusade against the wise

²⁹ *The sad shepherd* (Herford and Simpson, VII, 9-10).

³⁰ Jonson's interest in having within the confines of a single play something to suit everyone is also witnessed by the prologue to *Epicene*:

"To present all custard, or all tart,
And haue no other meats, to beare a part,
Or to want bread, and salt, were but coarse art.
The *Poet* prays you then, with better thought
To sit; and, when his cates are all in brought,
Though there be none far fet, there will deare-bought
Be fit for ladies; some for lords, knights, squires,
Some for your waiting wench, and citie-wires,
Some for your men, and daughters of *white-Friars*"

(Herford and Simpson, V, 163).

³¹ Neither Guarini nor Fletcher would, I think, have admitted as appropriate in the pastoral "Rurall Routs and Families." Guarini's and Fletcher's conception of the mood properly evoked by the pastoral is reflected by Samuel Daniel:

"Here shall I bring you the two most entire
And constant Lovers that were ever seen,
From out the greatest Sufferings of Annoy
That Fortune could inflict, to their full Joy:
Wherein no wild, no rude, no anticke Spirit,
But tender Passions, Motions soft and grave
The still Spectators must expect to have"

(Prologue, *Hymen's triumph*).

³² Smith, p. 384.

woman and her confederate powers, which should be the means of restoring Earine to her Sad Shepherd. Thus the story of these lovers alone can supply the materials for the main, or indeed for any real plot at all; and the fact that, as Mr. Homer Smith informs us, out of some thousand lines less than half are devoted to strictly pastoral interests, is but evidence of the felicity of construction, by which Jonson while keeping the pastoral plot as the mainspring of the piece, nevertheless avoided the tediousness almost inseparable from action and atmosphere, and threw the burden of stage business upon the more congenial personages of Maid Marian, Robin Hood, and his merry men, the Witch of Paplewich, and Robin Goodfellow.³³

One surely cannot speak with any degree of certainty about the structure of a play, part of whose third and all of whose fourth and fifth acts remain unwritten, even unoutlined. And, in Jonson's case, it is particularly dangerous to speak so, for, once at least, did he not avow his intention to "perplex" his last act and "spring some fresh cheat, to entertaine the *Spectators*, with a convenient delight, till some unexpected, and new encounter breake out to rectify all, and make good the *Conclusion*?"³⁴ Let that critic beware who believes that the complication between Robin Hood and Maid Marian is solved by the end of the second act. Jonson might well have said to him. "Ending here [the play] would have showne dull, flat, and unpointed; without any shape, or sharpnesse."³⁵ All that it seems safe to say of the play is that it has a multiplex plot, the two chief elements of which are (1) Robin Hood, Maid Marian, and their woodland crew and (2) Aeglamour and Earine, and that these remain essentially distinct, though there is some interaction between the two sets of char-

acters and though Maudlin, the witch, is the schemer in both actions.

Jonson's disdain of orthodoxy in other matters than plot is clearly apparent everywhere in *The sad shepherd*, as well as in its prologue. His "Mirth" turns out to be much more "Laughter holding both his sides" than Guarini's modest amusement. His witch and her offspring certainly "keep decorum" in speaking in dialect rather than in the elegant poetic accents of Guarini's shepherds. And, if there is comedy which verges on forbidden farce in Lorell's uncouth courting, there is also a tendency to treat the shepherds themselves with less seriousness than Guarini might have favored—though in the case of Aeglamour and the wistful little Amie no one could find fault with Jonson's tender portrayals. Robin Hood and his whole jovial crew, moreover, are foreign to Guarini's Arcadian forests.

What we have, then, in *The sad shepherd* is an entire disregard of any classical concept of the drama. Guarini, we now can see, was not really so classical as he would have liked us, or at any rate his more pedantic contemporaries, to believe; but, even so, his conception of structure was much more traditional than Jonson's. Complex though his plot is, it can be described as a unit; that of *The sad shepherd* defies such description. Therefore, not only was Jonson not classical in an absolute sense, he was not even classical in the more elaborate Renaissance sense.

Whether Rutter ever saw the manuscript of *The sad shepherd* or heard Jonson set forth his ideas concerning the pastoral, we do not know. But Rutter need never have seen the play in order to know that his father and master taught, and practiced, the art of producing plays which disregarded the teachings of Aristotle. Witness the many plots set afoot by the wily Brayneworme in *Every man in his*

³³ Greg, p. 310.

³⁴ *The magnetick lady*. Induction after the fourth act, ll. 28-31 (Herford and Simpson, VI, 578).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 32-33.

humour; the many strands of intrigue in *Every man out of his humour*, in *Cynthia's revels*, *The divell is an asse*, *The staple of newes*, and *The magnetick lady*. Even *Epicoene* and *The alchemist*, so often considered the great plays of Jonson's prime, demonstrate that Ben's interest was not in a "single subject," for in the former the revelation of the identity of the Silent Woman is the dénouement of three separate actions and in the latter the schemes of Subtle, Face, and Dol set under way no less than six intrigues. And no one has been able to discover a main action in *Bartholmew Fayre*.³⁶

³⁶ For a discussion of the nonclassical nature of the structure of Jonson's comedies see my *Apologie for "Bartholmew Fayre"* (New York, 1947).

It is Jonson the unorthodox, anti-Aristotelian author of *The sad shepherd*, Jonson who so well knew the "woofe and warpe" of plays both classical and modern, who praised Rutter and Fletcher. His "censure," then, tells us that in his eyes Rutter had achieved a well-made play, though analysis of *The shepheards holy-day* shows that the play defies the principle of unity of plot. It tells us, further, that Jonson's dramatic laws were most probably original in their formulation and had little to do with ancient prescriptions. No critic of Jonson, as lawgiver or as dramatist, can afford to ignore his praise of Rutter's unclassical play.

WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS

THE THEME OF NIGHT IN FOUR SONNETS OF MALLARMÉ

WALLACE FOWLIE

THE theme of absence or vacuity furnishes Mallarmé, paradoxically, with his richest theme. It generates the other accompanying themes of impotency and artificiality. It relates the philosophical lesson of idealism to that of the emptying tomb of poets. Whether it be the image of a sunset sinking into its subsequent darkness or that of a clown plunging into the icy waters of a lake, the poems of Mallarmé deal consistently and successively with the vanishing of one kind of life into another. The ultimate seems always to be night. And the one illumination which characterizes man's fate is the light in darkness, the afterglow or the piercing ray coming at midnight and serving to define the vastness of the black. The frequently recurring words in Mallarmé of "emptiness" (*vide*), "abolish" (*abolir*), "tomb" (*tombeau*), "pure" (*pur*), "absent" (*absent*), and the various negative locutions are all signs of the perpetual preoccupation with the work of the artist which is a mysterious alchemy, successful only when death takes place. The meaning of night itself seems to have been taken as a clue by Mallarmé for the paradox of the artist's work, which becomes real when an absence is consummated. The purity of night, together with its quality of absoluteness, has its counterpart in the human soul, where we learn to know, darkly and dimly, strands and fragments of absolute truth.

Mallarmé consecrated this theme of night and made it into something very personal and unique in his own work. But he was born into a century of artists, many of whom were preoccupied with the same theme. Nerval, Poe, Baudelaire,

Balzac, Goya, Delacroix, and Daumier are all artists of a night world. And especially Baudelaire, whose tragedy is staged in darkness, whose experience of evil is projected throughout *Les Fleurs du mal* by means of a symbolic and choreographic use of night.

Mallarmé discovered Baudelaire for the first time in 1861. *Les Fleurs du mal*, published in 1857, was the only book of poems, with Poe's poems, which influenced Mallarmé's own writing to any profound and significant extent. The early poems are replete with Baudelaire's vocabulary and images, and with at least one aspect of his theme of impotency. Mallarmé never met Baudelaire personally, and there was never any exchange of letters between the two poets. But throughout Mallarmé's career, long after he had evolved his own style and found his own voice, Baudelaire remained close to him and revered by him as the great source poet of the age.

The dandyism of Baudelaire, which was infinitely more profound than a mere pose or attitude, was bequeathed to Mallarmé in a somewhat altered, but still recognizable, form. In its spiritual sense Baudelaire's dandyism was the artist's heroism of concentration, the almost fatal need to adorn himself in so special and personal a way that he will be separated from all other men. The artist must be unique, or he has failed. He must discover the costume and the words which will mark him off from all other modes of attraction and communication. Dandyism is the effort to suppress all instinctive impulses and to forge a studied personality, to show to the world only the reflective and the critical thoughts. Originality has

to be cultivated and prepared before it can be exhibited. The dandy is the aristocrat of the spirit because he is really the actor playing the role of critic.

Baudelaire believed that his character, his own being, when submitted to the scrutiny and the discipline worthy of a dandy, when trained and chastised by his highest critical faculties, would emerge *infallible*. As an artist, he applied the same principle to his work. But here, Mallarmé went even further than Baudelaire. There is certainly something of the dandy in Mallarmé's composed and serene manner; in his speech, which so often was doctrinal exposition couched in a language well-nigh esoteric; in his general attitude of sage and high priest and martyr. But much more than Baudelaire, although here he was initiated and directed by the example of Baudelaire, Mallarmé became the dandy as artist. His poems are like distilled essences. He worked over them for years until they attained a degree of infallibility. If meticulousness of dress was for Baudelaire a sign of aristocracy and distinction of spirit, the verbal and exterior communication of a poem was for Mallarmé the symbol of an idea and the artifice resulting from the effort to translate or adorn the idea.

Baudelaire was infinitely more isolated from human beings than Mallarmé. And he liked to consider his book as essentially useless. Distinctiveness for the dandy would lead to ostracism in a social sense and to esoterism in an aesthetic sense. Baudelaire was more successful in the first of these, in his remoteness from human beings, and Mallarmé in the second, in the hermetic quality of his published work. Mallarmé's early sonnet, "Angoisse," originally entitled "A une putain," is purely Baudelairean in theme and texture. The legend of the poem does not go further than stating the moral dilemma

of the Anguish. Vice has marked the poet as well as the prostitute by its repetitive, and hence sterilizing, characteristics. The poet has grown to fear death ("Ayant peur de mourir lorsque je couche seul"), because of the particular understanding of death which sin has given him. The sonnet describes Baudelaire's world and his moral struggle. It relates to very little in Mallarmé's life, save his initial tendency to imitate Baudelaire. The moral connotation of sterility was soon transposed by Mallarmé into the artist's dread, first, of not being able to produce, and, second, of all art's fundamental incapacity to translate the idea or the dream or the experience.

"Angoisse," of very direct Baudelairean inspiration, was probably written about 1862.¹ Almost at the end of his life, in 1895, Mallarmé published his sonnet of homage, "Le Tombeau de Charles Baudelaire,"² which is a mature expression of his art, containing all his peculiarities of style. The sonnet is a uniquely Mallarmé piece, but it reveals the poet's essential role of critic. It stands by itself, in its own particular kind of beauty, but it bears, as does every great lyric, a terrifying weight of relationships with the past and the future, with Baudelaire, with all poets, and with man in general.

Le temple enseveli divulgue par la bouche
Sépulcrale d'égout bavant boue et rubis
Abominablement quelque idole Anubis
Tout le museau flambé comme un aboi farouche

Ou que le gaz récent torde la mèche louche
Essuyeuse on le sait des opprobres subis
Il allume hagard un immortel pubis
Dont le vol selon le réverbère découche

Quel feuillage séché dans les cités sans soir
Votif pourra bénir comme elle se rasseoir
Contre le marbre vainement de Baudelaire

¹ First published in *Le Parnasse contemporain*, May 12, 1866, under the title, "A celle qui est tranquille."

² First published in *La Plume*, January 15, 1895.

Au voile qui la ceint absente avec frissons
Celle son Ombre même un poison tutélaire
Toujours à respirer si nous en périssons.³

First quatrain.—The temple, symbol of consecration, the place where time and eternity join, where man and the absolute discover their relationship, is revealed by a sewer mouth. Out from this aperture pour mud and rubies. The image of the hidden temple reveals the idol Anubis, god of death, composed of a man's body and a jackal's head. With smoke pouring out from its nostrils, as if it barked, it stands in the underground temple, an object to be worshiped. These four opening lines treat the problem of duality: the religious aspiration of man's life, on the one hand, and its crass realism, on the other. They depict the disproportion between the secret spiritual reality of man's heritage throughout the ages (one thinks here of ancient Egypt) and the immediate viciousness and imperfection of any given life, especially of Baudelaire's, where spleen (*boue*) and ideal (*rubis*) vied with one another. The calm, remote beginning ("le temple enseveli") is soon covered up and forgotten by the harshness and heaviness of the excessive alliteration on *b*: *bouche, bavant boue et rubis, abominablement, Anubis, aboi*. Thus the treasures of the spirit and our aspirations issue forth from us irreparably transformed by all our attendant vices. And for the poet espe-

cially, for any artist, there exists the vast chasm between the idea and its realization, the discrepancy which belabors him and opposes him and to which he submits rather than continue the strife. In the temple stands the hideous Anubis, so revolting when contrasted with the god it represents; and in the world stands the body of man, the vessel of purity and hope, now sullied, now mutilated and abused despite its spiritual alliance and its charge.

Second quatrain.—Follows, then, a picture of modern Paris, and particularly of Baudelaire's Paris: that is, night and streets now lighted for the first time by gas lamps. The wick in the lamps gives off a flickering flame because of the insults heaped on it. But we realize the insults were directed on what the flame illumines: the body of a prostitute. She is the walker in Baudelaire's nocturnal Paris, who goes from lamp to lamp and whose shadow moving down the street resembles the flight of a bird. The image comes to us clearly because of the adjective *hagard*, a medieval word used in falconry and derived from *haga* or *haie*, the *hedge* where the pursued bird takes refuge from the falcon and, terrified, conceals itself in the branches. The statue of the idol, half-man and half-animal, belonging to antiquity, is replaced by its modern prototype, the prostitute, half-human and half-bird, who receives insults rather than prayers.

The tercets.—Since the invention of gas and since the decline of prayerfulness and religious practice in the life of modern man, the nights have lost both their physical aspect of darkness and their spiritual significance. The shade of Baudelaire, returning to sit by its marble tomb, will not bless the withered wreath of flowers and leaves it may find there. The shade is the absence of the poet. Only a fluttering veil, which may well be a night shadow, sug-

³ Literal translation by author:

"The buried temple divulges through the sepulchral
Mouth of a sewer drooling mud and rubies
Abominably some Anubis idol
Its whole muzzle aflame like a wild bark
Or the recent gas twists the squint-eyed wick
Which has been submitted to countless insults
And illumines terrified an immortal public bone
Whose flight moves from lamppost to lamppost
What dried leaves in the cities without votive
Night will bless as the shade sits down
Vainly against the marble of Baudelaire
In the fluttering veil which covers it absent
His own shade a protecting poison
Always to be smelled even if we perish from it."

gests the returning shade. But even the shade of such a poet as Baudelaire was, is a poison which maintains our own maladies derived from his. Even if they ultimately cause our death, we breathe them in as we receive our very heritage.

Summary.—The many images of this sonnet combine with one another like the construction of a tomb itself on which a bas-relief would depict symbolically the achievements of a life. The images are grouped, and each group is dominated by one centralizing and fortifying image, which assumes the metaphorical strength and responsibility. First, the "Anubis," the god of death, in the temple, whose mouth is open like a sewer's. The smoke from the temple sacrifice, coming out from the mouth and nostrils of the idol, is related to the image of the sewer, out of which oozes the mud incrustated with the lost gems of the city. The Anubis is the image of the poet's relationship with the Eternal. In the world of fictional freedom, Baudelaire was attached to God and immobilized by his thoughts on God. His response to God may at times have been that of a puppet (cf. "Au Lecteur") and the cowering of a primitive child before the mystery of God. But Baudelaire knew profoundly the experience of religious aspiration and felt, as he did in other kinds of dramas, his incapacity to move out from the magnetic attraction to God. He was immobilized in the temple, not so much as a man is but as an idol is.

Second, the "pubic bone," or the belly of the prostitute, with the concomitant images of the gas lamps, which illumine the body and the movement of flight down the street. Like the night scene of sacrifice in the temple, the body of the whore is stylized into a skeletal apparition, immortal, too, because the desire of the flesh is the other aspect of man's aspiration. It, too, is an image toward immortal-

ity. It, too, is a prayer, but of such subtlety and trickery that it may bend man toward the eternity of death rather than toward the immortality of life.

Third, the "poison" emanating from Baudelaire's shade. The night, in the image itself, is pervaded with it, as the poets of our contemporary world have been transformed by experiencing the form of Baudelaire's art, by smelling his flowers of evil. The paradox is vast and absolute. Art is at once human experience and the form given to it. And the particular beauty of tragic experience bears with it a deeper spiritual significance than any artistic depiction of attainment to holiness.

In all three images there is an alliance of horror and beauty, of what Baudelaire termed *spleen et idéal*: (1) the sewer mouth and the Anubis; (2) night opprobrium and the immortality of the pubic bone; (3) the fatal poison and the poet's shade. Mallarmé has used in the sonnet his favorite method of describing the poet: he has evoked the absence of the poet—the shade which is an effulgence, the leaf which has withered, the prostitute who has become a pubic bone and whose form disappears down the street as each lamp is lighted, the temple which has disappeared underground. The marble tomb, like the literary work itself, is but a fragile receptacle: it can hardly contain the spiritual reality of the poet. Night is the permanent symbol of the poet. Whether it be symbolized by the darkness underground of the buried temple or by the black of physical night in the city or by the inclosed obscurity of the tomb, the signal greatness of Baudelaire, or of any comparable poet, is measured by his ability to live in the night, to see, to worship, to love, to sin, in the world of night.

Mallarmé's sonnet on Poe, another "tomb" like that of Baudelaire, was read

at Baltimore, on November 17, 1875, on the occasion of the unveiling of the poet's tombstone.⁴

The history of Poe's influence in France is totally unlike that of his influence in America. Baudelaire read the first French translations of Poe about 1846-47 and felt instantaneously that he had discovered a spiritual brother, a fraternal genius whose particular destiny in America helped him to understand his own in France. When Baudelaire read a translation of "The black cat" in *La Démocratie pacifique* of January 27, 1847, many of his aesthetic principles were already clear to him, but he sensed such a close affinity with Poe that he began a transformation of the life and works of the American that permitted him a self-identification with the poet on the other side of the Atlantic.

He discovered in Poe sentences that had been thought out by himself. In this shock of recognition, Poe's life grew to represent for Baudelaire a tragic duel between the poet and his country. Revolt was the only possible attitude for the artist. Alcohol and drugs provided a method of work for the genius and an escape from his hostile surroundings. But all this is slightly false. Poe was neither such a revolutionary nor such an alcoholic as Baudelaire made him appear to the French, and even to many Americans. The violence and deep sense of tragedy of Baudelaire's spirit were not in Poe. The French poet did not deliberately falsify the facts of Poe's character, but he practiced a wilful obsession to see himself in Poe.

In the realm of aesthetics, it is beyond doubt that Baudelaire owed much to the American. Baudelaire's translations of Poe actually created a new artistic move-

ment in France. "The poetic principle," a lecture which Poe delivered twice in November, 1848, in Providence, Rhode Island, and in Lowell, Massachusetts, is the main source for the aesthetics of "pure poetry." This lecture, unheeded in America, became in France a manifesto for the poets. Baudelaire was its illustrator and champion.

The main ideas in "The poetic principle," which Baudelaire incorporated in his aesthetics, having already felt them to some degree before knowing Poe, might be stated under three headings. First, since the beautiful is perceived only fleetingly and fragmentarily, the poem, which is the fragile receptacle for this perception of the beautiful, must be brief. The poet's thought must be cast into a condensed image. Second, the didactic is nonpoetic. There exists a basic incompatibility between poetry and practical usefulness. Boston puritanism had made poetry resemble sermons destined to edify and instruct. Poe opposed this in his cult for pure beauty (even if there might be a transcendental moral in it). Third, the beauty in a poem offers a means for spiritual perception or awareness. Through poetry we can perceive the beauty of the spiritual universe. The poet is a translator. Both Poe and Baudelaire had studied Swedenborg's system of correspondences, in which the material world is considered a key to the spiritual world. Poetry is therefore, according to Poe's *poetic principle*, the "rhythmical creation of beauty." It is the revelation of a world existing outside the logical rules of reason. "Le principe de la poésie est l'aspiration humaine vers une Beauté supérieure et la manifestation de ce principe dans un enthousiasme, un enlèvement de l'âme."⁵

Many of these theories are in Baudelaire's *Salon* of 1846, written before he had

⁴ Sara Sigourney Rice, *The Poe memorial* (Baltimore, 1877), p. 93.

⁵ Baudelaire, *Art romantique*.

discovered Poe. But the American helped to give precision and force to Baudelaire's tendencies. He helped the French poet to separate himself from the theories of Gautier, Banville, and Ménard. Such phrases as these, from *Marginalia*, must have been dear to Baudelaire, and later to Mallarmé: "I know that indefiniteness is an element of the true music—I mean of the true musical expression. Give it any undue decision—imbue it with any very determinate tone—and you deprive it, at once, of its ethereal, its ideal, its intrinsic and essential character."⁶ And the sentence: "I believe that odors have an altogether peculiar force, in affecting us through association."⁷ It is true that Poe's sentimentalism was vastly different from Baudelaire's sensuous realism, but the latter's deep need of finding himself in someone else justified the fictional Poe he created.

Mallarmé continued Baudelaire's cult of Poe and derived from the example of the American a lesson somewhat nearer the actual truth. Temperamentally, Mallarmé was closer to Poe than Baudelaire was. Although he accepted Baudelaire's two explanations for Poe's drunkenness (an effort, first, to escape from the horror of his destiny and, second, to attain a spiritual vision), he saw in Poe the image of his own flat and pale bourgeois existence. Like Poe, Mallarmé believed in the alliance between poetry and the arts and in the secret meaning of the world. Both Poe and Mallarmé relegated passion to an obscure position in their cosmos. The purity of ideas and symbols and Poe's atmosphere of supernatural strangeness are in the poetry of Mallarmé (especially in *Prose pour des Esseintes*). The preciosity of tombs and deathlike objects, unusual and rare words, themes of sterility and

obscurity, are in Poe in some degree, and in Mallarmé in a degree that is all-important.

LE TOMBEAU D'EDGAR POE

Tel qu'en Lui-même enfin l'éternité le change,
Le Poète suscite avec un glaive nu
Son siècle épouvanté de n'avoir pas connu
Que la mort triomphait dans cette voix
étrange!

Eux, comme un vil sursaut d'hydre oyant jadis
l'ange
Donner un sens plus pur aux mots de la tribu
Proclamèrent très haut le sortilège bu
Dans le flot sans honneur de quelque noir mélange

Du sol et de la nue hostiles, ô grief!
Si notre idée avec ne sculpte un bas-relief
Dont la tombe de Poe éblouissante s'orne

Calme bloc ici-bas chu d'un désastre obscur
Que ce granit du moins montre à jamais sa
borne

Aux noirs vols du Blasphème épars dans le
futur.⁸

First quatrain.—The opening line, perhaps the most celebrated single line of Mallarmé and the most quoted and used in contemporary criticism, is, when taken singly, an entire sermon or discourse on the fate and the function of the poet. This succinct and condensed statement, which here Mallarmé applies to the individual

⁸ Literal translation by the author:

"Like as into Himself eternity at last changes him,
The Poet resurrects with a naked sword
His century terrified at not having known
That death triumphed in that strange voice!

They, like a mean twist of a serpent hearing once the
angel

Give a purer meaning to the words of the tribe
Proclaimed out loud the witch charm drunk
From the honorless wave of some dark mixture

If our understanding does not carve a bas-relief
Of the hostile earth and cloud, o grievance!
With which Poe's wondrous tomb may be adorned

Stable block fallen here below from an obscure disaster

May this granite at least show forever its position
To the black flights of Blasphemy scattered in the
future."

⁶ *Complete works of Edgar A. Poe*, ed. James A. Harrison (New York, 1902), XVI, 29.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

fate of Poe, the object of his celebration in verse, might well be applied to himself and to any poet. Its theme is the universality of the poet's fate, the hostility and the lack of comprehension of the artist's time. The living accept the mediocre man who tells them what they wish to hear. Only the future generation will read and understand the poet who is superior. "Eternity" in this passage is time, all that time beyond the lifetime of the poet, when he will exist not in his body and temperament and individuality but in his work, which becomes absolute only at the death of its creator. That is death's triumph: the passing of the poet is the event which makes his voice complete. The poet is like an angel, and his work is like a bared and flaming sword. After his generation has passed, this angel with the sword, like a magician with a wand, can resurrect a century which once was terrified at not having recognized its real voice. The age, without its poet, is inexplicable and unjustified. This quatrain contains Mallarmé's central philosophy or doctrine on the poet. An absolute statement in itself, it might serve as introduction to all the poems of Mallarmé and to the work of all the poets. It is almost the condensation of one hundred years' thinking about the poet, about the strange alchemy of time, which ends by revealing the true stature of a poet and which illumines the images of his poetry. The poet himself, during his own lifetime, could not behold that luminosity, which is always future.

Second quatrain.—"They" are the contemporaries of Poe, who, incapable of understanding the poet, made him into a pariah and ostracized him from society. The image of Mallarmé is just, because the strangeness of Poe is not in his life (as Baudelaire might have stated) but in his work, in the words, the recognizable familiar words in everyone's speech, which

the poet used in so particular a way that they revealed a new purity. Like an angel, Poe instructed his generation in the original purity of words, but they loudly called his art witchcraft and the raving of a drunken poet. They seized upon a weakness in his personal life and used it to explicate and denounce an art which lay beyond their sensitivity. How could an angel or a prophet, clothed in his habitual whiteness, rise up in the body of a man who had lost himself in the black potency of alcohol?

Tercets.—A strong vibrant line opens the tercets forming the second part of the poem and parallels the initial line of the sonnet. This is a song of grievance and accusation. Great opposing forces of matter and spirit, of the earth and of the clouds, are at war in every man, but to an extraordinary degree in the poet, who is able to give voice to the hostility. The old medieval debate between the body and the soul, which Villon wrote in the fifteenth century, is in Poe, too, particularized by his moment in history. Mallarmé evokes this grievance, this source of personal tragedy and art, as one other poet whose life-history and lifework may add to Poe's tomb one more legend or figure. The literal stone of the monument seems to have fallen from the sky itself. It was once a star (*aster*), a flamingly brilliant life. Now it is a cold, hard substance (*disaster*), having fallen from its orbit. The work of a poet always forms at a great distance from the earth and then, when transmitted, becomes fixed and cold in its durable form. The granite, so established on the earth as a testimony and marking place, may, as its slightest function, reveal to mankind what was sacrificed to blasphemy and accusation against the creative spirit of one age. In the future, when this spirit of blasphemy is again aroused, it will see, as if it were a bird of

prey in the heavens, this tomb of Poe, a permanent reminder of one of its past victories.

Summary.—Commencing with the word "eternity," and concluding with the word "future," the sonnet on Poe invokes the drama of time, which, first, at the moment of the poet's death makes absolute his poetic work and which, second, initiates the period of no termination when the meaning and the power of the work develop and change as the work, rendered absolute, is comprehended or rejected or reflected in the poetic consciousness of each succeeding temporal period. The poet's tomb is the work's life. The final physical immobility coincides with the adventure of communication which a work of art must endure and risk. The strange words spoken by the poet to his own age are the only ones which future ages will remember and hear. The once incomprehensible becomes in time the revelatory. The years interpret the poet's message and unveil his art. After all, he had used the words of his own people, but language is a combination of words, and they must cohabit a long time, in a metaphorical bond, before they yield their simplicity.

So concealed and unrecognizable is purity, at first, that it has to be matched by a pure kind of contemplation. The pivotal metaphor of the sonnet on Poe is the stone tomb, the block of granite which may have fallen from the sky when the meteor of fire burned out in its course through space. The hardened matter, fixed in the earth's surface like a boundary mark, on which the words and the figures of a legend are engraved, was once a burning substance in time, comparable to the living body of a man. Both bodies rushed toward an eternal immobility. The body in the tomb and the experience in the verse attain a state of absoluteness after their race through the night.

The night imagery of these two sonnets is that of an expansive exterior night. For Baudelaire's tomb the scene is, first, a city street and then a vaguely defined area by the marble monument, where the poet's ghost returns only to find the coolness of the earth and the withered flowers and the lack of prayerfulness in the night that was once his prayer. For Poe's tomb the scene is the endless hostility between the earth and the sky, in the center of which the granite block shines, but in a darkness from which it has fallen, through some astrological or fatalistic law. The expanse of blackness, so threateningly exposed in the final line of the sonnet, obscures the human drama unfolding both on the earth and in the skies.

The expense and the expanse of night are images suited in each case to designate the drama of the dead poet. The stars in the sky and the stars fallen from the sky (*désastre*) describe the life-cycle of the poet and the work's culmination. The night setting, particularly that which is endless and shapeless, is the metaphorical equivalent of the poet's vain search for a place in his world, as well as the search for his work, for the cosmos created by the power of words. Mallarmé, by the persistent use he makes of this imagery, implies that this poet's cosmos constructed with words is, at best, tenebrific; is at best the mere shadow cast by the unformed work in the poet's mind.

Thus are established the Baudelairean-Swedenborgian correspondences. As the world bears a spiritual analogy with heaven, so night teaches, by negation, the meaning of day. We see darkly in the imperfect light, which is the absence of day. The dream of the poet, his creative idea, clings to him and threatens him like the obscuration of night. The creative idea has no position in space because it lives like a desire. It is always ready to disap-

pear: night would welcome and consummate its dissolution. If the idea of the poem did vanish, before becoming a poem in words, it would mount to the starry garlands in the sky or to some comparable distance, where it would become just barely visible, as some diminished memory, to the lonely poet.

Night is a celebration. But the celebration is invisible to the man who inhabits the night. In the tercets of Mallarmé's sonnet, "*Quand l'ombre menaçait de la fatale loi,*"⁹ the poet evokes the dazzling light which the earth must manifest at a tremendous distance from itself when it is still covered with the darkness of night:

Où, je sais qu'au lointain de cette nuit, la
Terre
Jette d'un grand éclat l'insolite mystère
Sous les siècles hideux qui l'obscurcissent
moins.¹⁰

But this natural and physical celebration of night, carried on at a vast distance from the earth, serves as a setting for another celebration, that of the poetic genius. The fires of a star or the light of the earth seen as a star is nothing by comparison with the radiance of a genius:

L'espace à soi pareil qu'il s'accroisse ou se nie
Roule dans cet ennui des feux vils pour témoins
Que s'est d'un astre en fête allumé le génie.¹¹

By the phrase, *le génie d'un astre* ("the genius of a star"), Mallarmé creates an analogy between the time it takes the

light of a star to reach the earth and the time needed for an artistic work to grow into a visible reality for men. If the age when a genius lived does not perceive his work, succeeding ages may see more clearly.

A poetic creation is a struggle against night. Because night has the power of pervasiveness, of limitlessness, of formlessness (*vaste comme la nuit*), the work of art, conceived in an atmosphere hostile to itself, must oppose all these qualities of night by its need of condensation and form. Night is a macrocosm: temporally and spatially extending forever and everywhere. A poem is a microcosm completed, condensed, reserved. They move in different directions: night, outward and beyond all limits; the poem, inward toward the limitation of words and the compression of meanings.

One of Mallarmé's most achieved sonnets, "Tombeau," written to celebrate the first anniversary of Verlaine's death, January, 1897,¹² which was just a year before Mallarmé's own death, contains a brilliantly conceived combination of the themes of night, the poet, and the poetic work. This is almost the last poem Mallarmé wrote, and in it he is still concerned with the aspect of exterior night which floods all space. Almost all the elements are familiar, having appeared in the earlier sonnets on Baudelaire and Poe: the stone itself of the tomb, the star, the public. But there is, in this testimonial to Verlaine, a new conception of movement and flight through the darkness. The waywardness of Verlaine's life is symbolized by the rolling rock of his tomb. This rock has taken on the aspect of human woes and will not stop in its motion, even if pious hands touch it in order to feel the legends of disaster engraved on it and to

⁹ Published in 1884 in "Les Poètes maudits," by Paul Verlaine, *Lutèce*, No. 95, November 24, 1883, with the title "Cette nuit."

¹⁰ Literal translation by author:

"Yes, I know that far off from this night, the Earth
Casts the unusual mystery of a great brilliance
Under the hideous centuries which darken it less."

¹¹ Literal translation by author:

"Space like to itself whether it increase or deny itself
Rolls in that boredom vile fires to witness
That the genius of a star in celebration has been
lighted."

¹² Published in *Revue blanche*, January, 1897.

bless it as if it were a mold of human fate:

Le noir roc courroucé que la bise le roule
Ne s'arrêtera ni sous de pieuses mains
Tâtant sa ressemblance avec les maux humains
Comme pour en bénir quelque funeste moule.¹³

The second quatrain condenses the three sonnets heretofore discussed. In the night scene, if the voice from the branches (that is, the voice of nature, which is the poet's voice) continues to speak, the darkness itself (that is, the sign of mourning) will hide by its shadows the luminosity of the poet's work (that is, luminosity for the future, when the work can be seen in perspective), and, from the light growing with time, some ray will be appropriated from the world of men who, at first, denied it:

Ici presque toujours si le ramier roucoule
Cet immatériel deuil opprime de maints
Nubiles plis l'astre mûri des lendemains
Dont un scintillement argentera la foule.¹⁴

The two tercets amplify the first line of the sonnet by contrasting the vagabondage of Verlaine's real life with the flight adventure of his work through the world after the poet's literal death. After the initial question, "Who now looks for Verlaine by following the footsteps of his solitary life?" comes the answer: "He is hidden in the grass." Which seems to mean: he is continuing his existence even after death. His work is like the surface of the shallow river, which bears the reflection of

¹³ Literal translation by author:

"The black angry rock which the wind rolls
Will not stop even if under pious hands
Feeling its resemblance with human woes
As if to bless some ill-fated mold."

¹⁴ Literal translation by author:

"Here almost always if the branches sing,
This immaterial mourning hides with many
Nubile folds [clouds] the matured star of tomorrow
Whose scintillation will whiten all men."

his face. The river of death, the Lethe river of extinction or oblivion, has been slandered because the lips reflected therein, like those of Narcissus, even if they do not drink of the water, will remain in fixed immobility. The reflected face, which is comparable to the poetic creation, henceforth steadfast in time, is in profound harmony with death, which has made possible the final achievement. The ultimate simplicity or naïveté is thus attained by death, which is the eternalization of a lifework. The artist does not drink of the river of death, as an ordinary man does; he looks into it and thus is able to continue his existence in an extraordinary mode, after the accident of death:

Qui cherche, parcourant le solitaire bond
Tantôt extérieur de notre vagabond—
Verlaine? Il est caché parmi l'herbe, Verlaine

A ne surprendre que naïvement d'accord
La lèvre sans y boire ou tarir son haleine
Un peu profond ruisseau calomnié la mort.¹⁵

This sonnet to Verlaine is not so strong a unity in itself as it is a composition uniting all the sonnets on the "dark night" of the poet. The rolling rock of the first quatrain, which bears all the marks of human woe and deepens them as it continues its career through time, becomes, in the second quatrain, the constellation expending its light throughout the future and, in the tercets, becomes the river, not of death, but of Narcissus. It is a sonnet of three symbols: rock, star, water, all of which symbolize the work of the poet and are characterized by movement through time and space.

¹⁵ Literal translation by author:

"Who seeks, stalking the solitary figure
Just now literal of our vagabond—
Verlaine? He is hidden in the grass, Verlaine

In experiencing the naïve agreement between
The lips, without drinking or stopping the breath
So shallow a slandered river, and death."

The four Mallarmé sonnets, which illustrate the "dark night" of the poet, all describe the immensity and formlessness of night. That is the ambience and the challenge of the artist, who, out of formlessness, must create form. In each sonnet there is allusion to a tomb or funeral monument which, as if it were a stage property, is illuminated by some sharp distant light. In the sonnet on Baudelaire, the tomb is marble, and the light falls, at some distance away, from the gas lamps which line the street. The sonnet on Poe describes the monument as being of granite but also as having fallen from the sky as if at one time it had been part of a meteor. In the sonnet beginning "Quand l'ombre menaça," the sky itself is black and tomblike, but from its zenith a star radiates its light (*astre en fête*). And, finally, in the sonnet on Verlaine, where the rock of the tomb is constantly moving, the matured star (*astre mûri*) appears fixed in the sky.

But in each of the poems the poet himself is evoked as well as his tomb. For Baudelaire, it is the ghost whose breath is poisonous as if the spirit of evil continued

in his work. For Poe, it is the poet with a bare sword, who continues to play, even after death, the role of man in revolt. In the sonnet, "Quand l'ombre menaça," the poet appears as a solitary figure dazzled with his own faith; and in the sonnet to Verlaine, the poet is a kind of Narcissus, reflecting himself in the waters of a river.

Darkness spreads everywhere throughout these four "tombs" or "nights," and the four figures of the poet stand alone in the midst of the darkness as if they were the only principle of unity or order. Night, because of its vastness, seems to become in the Mallarmé sonnets the symbol of chaos; and the poet, because of his work to be achieved or already achieved, represents the opposing symbol of order. Creation is a struggle against night but must inexorably take place within night. Even when the conscience of a particular poet is destroyed, in the event of his death, his works preserve the conscience or the meaning of night which he had experienced. The obscurity of a work of art is only a little less obscure than the darkness in which it was conceived.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

VICTORIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1946

Edited by AUSTIN WRIGHT

THIS bibliography has been prepared by a committee of the Victorian Literature Group of the Modern Language Association of America: Austin Wright, chairman, Carnegie Institute of Technology; Charles Frederick Harrold, Ohio State University; William Irvine, Stanford University; and William Frost, Yale University. It attempts to list the noteworthy publications of 1946 (including reviews of these and earlier items) that have a bearing on English literature of the Victorian period, and similar publications of earlier date that have been inadvertently omitted from the preceding Victorian bibliography. Unless otherwise stated, the date of publication is 1946. Reference to a page in the bibliography for 1945, in *Modern philology*, May, 1946, is made by the following form: See VB 1945, 261. Some cross-references are given, although not all that are possible. For certain continuing bibliographical works the reader should consult VB 1941, the last annual bibliography in which such works were listed in full. The editor wishes to thank his predecessors, Professor Harrold and Professor William D. Templeman, for generous aid in presenting this bibliography.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

AB	= American bookman
AGR	= American-German review
AHR	= American historical review
AL	= American literature
AM	= Atlantic monthly
APSR	= American political science review
APSS	= Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science
ASR	= American sociological review
BBDI	= Bulletin of bibliography and dramatic index

BLR	= Bodleian Library record
BSP	= Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America
CE	= College English
CHJ	= Cambridge historical journal
CLS	= Comparative literature studies
CR	= Contemporary review
CWd	= Catholic world
DUJ	= Durham University journal
EHR	= English historical review
EJ	= English journal
ELH	= Journal of English literary history
Est	= English studies
Ex	= Explicator
FR	= Fortnightly review
HJ	= Hibbert journal
HLQ	= Huntington Library quarterly
HTB	= New York Herald-Tribune weekly book review
JAA	= Journal of aesthetics and art criticism
JEGP	= Journal of English and Germanic philology
JEH	= Journal of economic history
JHI	= Journal of the history of ideas
JMH	= Journal of modern history
JP	= Journal of philosophy
JPE	= Journal of political economy
JR	= Journal of religion
JRLB	= Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
KR	= Kenyon review
LAR	= Library Association record
LJ	= Library journal
LL	= Life and letters today
LQ	= Library quarterly
LQHR	= London quarterly and Holborn review
LR	= Library review
MLJ	= Modern language journal
MLN	= Modern language notes
MLQ	= Modern language quarterly
MLR	= Modern language review
MP	= Modern philology
M & L	= Music and letters
N	= Nation
NC	= Nineteenth century and after
NEQ	= New England quarterly
New R	= New Republic
NR	= National review
NS	= New statesman and nation
NYTBR	= New York Times book review

- ✓ *N & Q* = *Notes and queries*
- ✓ *ParR* = *Partisan review*
- ✓ *PLC* = *Princeton University Library chronicle*
- ✓ *PMLA* = *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*
- ✓ *PQ* = *Philological quarterly*
- ✓ *PSQ* = *Political science quarterly*
- ✓ *QJS* = *Quarterly journal of speech*
- ✓ *QQ* = *Queen's quarterly*
- ✓ *QR* = *Quarterly review*
- ✓ *QRL* = *Quarterly review of literature*
- ✓ *RES* = *Review of English studies*
- ✓ *RLC* = *Revue de littérature comparée*
- ✓ *RoR* = *Romanic review*
- ✓ *S* = *Spectator*
- ✓ *SAQ* = *South Atlantic quarterly*
- ✓ *SeR* = *Sevanee review*
- ✓ *SP* = *Studies in philology*
- ✓ *SRL* = *Saturday review of literature*
- ✓ *TLS* = *Times literary supplement*
- ✓ *TQ* = *University of Toronto quarterly*
- ✓ *VQR* = *Virginia quarterly review*
- ✓ *YR* = *Yale review*

I. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

"American bibliography for 1944." *PMLA*, LIX, Suppl., 1220-33: English, "Nineteenth century," and "Contemporary," ed. Albert C. Baugh and others.

"American bibliography for 1945." *PMLA*, LX, Suppl., 1233-48: English, "Nineteenth century," and "Contemporary," ed. Albert C. Baugh and others.

Anon. "One hundred great English books." *PLC*, VIII, 51-52.

Describes copies of several important Victorian first editions (*Pickwick*, *Vanity Fair*, *Jane Eyre*, *Adam Bede*) bequeathed to Princeton by Morris L. Parrish.

Between the lines: letters and memoranda interchanged by H. Buxton Forman and Thomas J. Wise. With a foreword by Carl H. Pforzheimer and an introductory essay and notes by Fannie E. Ratchford. Austin: Univ. of Texas pr., 1945. Pp. xii+38.

Rev. by S. L. C. Clapp in *Southwest rev.*, XXXI, 418-19; in *TLS*, June 1, p. 264.

Bond, Donald F.; Carrière, Joseph M.; and Seeber, Edward D. (eds.). "Anglo-French

and Franco-American studies: a current bibliography." *RoR*, XXXVII, 105-26.

Gallatin, A. E. *Aubrey Beardsley*. . . . See VB 1945, 260.

Rev. by Karl Kup in *BSP*, XL, 176-78; by L. C. Wroth in *HTB*, Aug. 4, p. 17.

Harrold, Charles Frederick (ed.). "The Romantic movement: a selective and critical bibliography for the year 1945." *ELH*, XIII, 1-37.

Harrold, Charles Frederick (ed.). "Victorian bibliography for 1945." *MP*, XLIII, 260-76.

Henkin, Leo J. "Problems and digressions in the Victorian novel (1860-1900)." (See VB 1945, 260.) *BBDI*, XVIII, 178-80, 230-32; XIX, 6-9.

Higgins, Thomas James. "Book-length biographies of engineers, metallurgists and industrialists." *BBDI*, XVIII, 206-10, 235-39; XIX, 9-12.

Includes many Victorians.

Kennedy, Arthur G. *A concise bibliography for students of English*. 2d ed. Stanford univ. pr., 1945. Pp. vii+161. See VB 1941, 385.

Rev. by A. T. Hazen in *LQ*, XVI, 80-81.

MacMinn, N.; Hains, J. R.; McCrimmon, J. M. *Bibliography of . . . J. S. Mill*. . . . See VB 1945, 260-61.

Miller, William. *The Dickens student and collector: a list of writings relating to Charles Dickens and his works, 1836-1945*. Harvard univ. pr. Pp. xii+351.

Rev. in *BBDI*, XIX, 5 ("a distinguished piece of work").

Palsits, Victor Hugo. "The bibliophilic transactions of James Lenox with Bernard Quaritch, 1874-1880." *BSP*, XL, 181-204.

Parrish collection. No. 1 of Volume VIII of the *Princeton university library chronicle* is dedicated to the Morris L. Parrish collection of Victorian literature, bequeathed to the Princeton university library.

Items as follows: Sadleir, Michael, "An English memory [recollections of Parrish]" (pp. 1-5);

Carter, John, "The library at Dormy House" (pp. 6-14, reprinted from *Colophon*, new graphic ser., No. 2, June, 1939); Parrott, Thomas M., "Morris L. Parrish and the Dormy House library" (pp. 15-17); Thorp, Margaret F., "The Kingsley collection" (pp. 18-20); Gerould, Gordon H., "The Dickens collection" (pp. 21-23); Christensen, Glenn J., "The Thomas Hardy collection" (pp. 24-27); Dickson, Sarah, "The Bulwer-Lytton collection" (pp. 28-32); Taylor, Robert H., "The Trollope collection" (pp. 33-37); Randall, David, "Some observations upon the Morris L. Parrish collection of Victorian literature, its rarer books, usefulness, etc." (pp. 38-50).

Rosenberg, Ralph P. "Bibliographies of theses in America." *BBDI*, XVIII, 181-82, 201-3.

"Sixty-ninth critical bibliography of the history of science and of the history of civilization." *Isis*, XXXVI, 193-202. *See ISI*
Section on the nineteenth century.

Smith, Alan. "An enquiry." *TLS*, Oct. 19, p. 507.

Letter regarding the Carter-Pollard *Enquiry*.

Stallman, R. W. "Annotated bibliography of A. E. Housman: a critical study." *PMLA*, LX (1945), 463-502.

Templeman, William D. (ed.) *Bibliographies of studies in Victorian literature, for the thirteen years 1932-44*. . . . See VB 1945, 261.

Rev. by N. Orsini ("utilissimo volume") in *Anglica: rivista di studi Inglesi e Americani* (Firenze), I, 168; by R. B. Dow in *BSP*, XL, 318-20; by A. T. Hazen in *LQ*, XVI, 362-64; by E. G. Cox in *MLQ*, VII, 375.

The year's work in English studies, Vol. XXIII (1942). Ed. for the English Assoc. by F. S. Boas. Oxford univ. pr. "The nineteenth century and after," pp. 186-223; "Bibliographica," pp. 224-32.

The year's work in English studies. Vol. XXIV (1943). Ed. for the English Assoc. by F. S. Boas. Oxford univ. pr. "The nineteenth century and after," pp. 184-222; "Bibliographica," pp. 223-33.

Rev. briefly in *N & Q*, Apr. 20, p. 155.

II. ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, RELIGIOUS, AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Aldington, Richard. *Wellington: an account of the life and achievements of Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington*. London: Heinemann. Pp. 372. (English title of *The Duke*. . . . See VB 1944, 232.)

Bowyer, S. L. "Randolph Caldecott." *TLS*, June 15, p. 283. See also July 6, p. 319; Aug. 3, p. 367.

Burlingame, Roger. *Of making many books: a hundred years of reading, writing and publishing*. New York: Scribner. Pp. xii+347. Rev. by Ellery Sedgwick in *HTB*, Nov. 3, p. 7; by H. M. Jones in *NYTBR*, Oct. 27, p. 4.

Carson, William G. B. (ed.). *Letters of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Kean*. . . . See VB 1945, 261. Rev. in *Theatre arts*, XXX, 191.

Chapman, Ronald. *The laurel and the thorn: a study of G. F. Watts*. . . . See VB 1945, 261.

Rev. by H. G. F. in *Connoisseur*, XCVII, 130-31. *765 CAN*

Clapham, Sir John Harold. *The Bank of England: a history*. . . . See VB 1945, 261.

Rev. by N. S. B. Gray in *AHR*, LI, 298-300.

Cole, Margaret. *Beatrice Webb*. New York: Harcourt. Pp. ix+229.

Rev. in *Amer. merc.*, LXIII, 501; by Mary E. Murphy in *APSS*, CCXLVII, 198-99; by W. H. Beveridge in *Econ. jour.*, LVI, 308-10; by Ernestine Evans in *HTB*, May 19, p. 3; by Eric Bentley in *New R*, May 20, pp. 736-37; by E. J. Holbaum in *Sci. & soc.*, X, 321-23.

Coupland, Sir Reginald. *Livingstone's last journey*. London: Collins. Pp. 271.

Rev. by Cecil Northeott in *FR*, No. 950, new ser., pp. 142-43; by Goronwy Rees in *S*, Feb. 8, p. 146.

Cruikshank, R. J. *The roaring century: 1846-1946*. London: Hamilton. Pp. 280.

Rev. by P. Aytman in *Dickensian*, LXIII, 24-25; by C. E. Vulliamy in *S*, Oct. 11, p. 372. A journalistic review of the early Victorian era, celebrating the centenary of the *London Daily News*.

- Dale, Sir Henry. "Experiment in medicine." *CHJ*, VIII, 166-78.
 Account of experimental method in medicine, with particular reference to the nineteenth century.
- Davis, Mary Gould. *Randolph Caldecott, 1846-1886: an appreciation*. New York: Lippincott. Pp. 7+46.
 Rev. by Phyllis Fenner in *HTB*, Nov. 10, p. 17.
- Dobb, Maurice. *Studies in the development of capitalism*. London: Routledge. Pp. ix+396.
 Rev. by G. D. N. Worswick in *NS*, Nov. 23, pp. 382-83.
- Evennett, Outram. "The Cambridge prelude to 1895: the story of the removal of the ban on universities told from the Cambridge angle." *Dublin rev.*, CCXVIII, 107-26.
- Flournoy, F. R. "British liberal theories of international relations (1848-1898)." *JHI*, VII, 195-217.
- Gill, Evan R. "Kate Greenaway." *TLS*, Mar. 23, p. 139.
- Gower, G. Leveson. "Lord Sherbrooke: a Victorian statesman." *NC*, CXL, 289-90.
- Gwynn, Denis. *Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin, and the Catholic revival*. London: Hollis & Carter. Pp. xxxviii+155.
 Rev. in *TLS*, Nov. 23, p. 581.
- Hawtrey, R. G. "Sir Charles Addis (1861-1945)." *EJ*, LVI, 507-10.
- Hedgpeth, Joel W. "The voyage of the *Challenger*." *Scientific monthly*, LXIII, 194-202.
 Circumnavigation of globe made on plans of a committee of which T. H. Huxley and A. R. Wallace were members. Led to beginning of science of oceanography.
- Hirst, Margaret E. *John Bright: a study*. London: Headley Bros. Pp. 118.
 Rev. in *TLS*, July 6, p. 316.
- Holbrook, John Pinckney. "Cruikshank's *Sketchbook*: the 'gold' question." *BSP*, XL, 225-28.
- Hubbard, Hesketh. *Some Victorian draughtsmen*. . . . See VB 1945, 262.
 Rev. by X. in *Connoisseur*, XCVII, 131-32.
- Hudson, Derek. "The Duke of Wellington's Miss J." *NR*, CLVII, 254-58.
- Hughes, M. Vivian. *A London family: 1870-1900*. Oxford univ. pr.
 Contains, in a single vol., *A London child of the seventies*, *A London girl of the eighties*, and *A London home of the nineties*.
- Ilchester, Earl of (ed.). *Elizabeth, Lady Holland, to her son, 1821-45*. London: John Murray. Pp. x+251.
 Rev. by Winifred Perrott in *NC*, CXXXIX, 229-37; by Ralph Partridge in *NS*, June 8, pp. 416-17; by Lettice Fowler in *S*, Apr. 12, p. 380; in *TLS*, Apr. 13, p. 174. Letters to Henry Edward Fox.
- Laird, John. *Philosophical incursions into English literature*. Cambridge univ. pr. Pp. viii+224.
 Includes sections on Dickens, Browning, and Hardy.
- Lawson, Robert. "The art of Caldecott and Greenaway." *NYTBR*, Mar. 17, p. 7.
- Lynd, Helen Merrell. *England in the eighteenthies*. . . . See VB 1945, 263.
 Rev. by Allen Hutt in *Sci. & soc.*, X, 419-21; in *TLS*, June 15, p. 281; by Wallace Notestein in *YR*, XXXV, 347-49.
- McLean, Ruari. "George Cruikshank." *TLS*, Mar. 9, p. 115.
- Maxwell, Constantia E. *A history of Trinity College, Dublin, 1591-1892: with a foreword by G. M. Trevelyan*. Dublin univ. pr. Pp. 229.
 Rev. in *N & Q*, Sept. 7, p. 110.
- Mineka, Francis E. *The dissidence of dissent*. . . . See VB 1945, 264.
 Rev. by Lewis Patton in *SAQ*, XLV, 395-96.
- Monksell, A. *A Victorian diarist: 1895-1909*. Ed. by E. C. F. Collier. London: Murray. See VB 1944, 234.
 A second volume of Lady Monksell's journals.

- Moore, Anne Carroll. *A century of Kate Greenaway*. London: Warne. Pp. 15.
Rev. in *TLS*, Mar. 23, p. 140.
- Morgan, Charles. *The house of Macmillan*. . . .
See VB 1945, 264.
Rev. by J. H. Shera in *LQ*, XVI, 173-75.
- Namier, L. B. *1848: the revolution of the intellectuals*. ("British Academy Raleigh lecture on history, 1944.") Oxford univ. pr. Pp. 24.
- Newcomb, Covelle. *The secret door: the story of Kate Greenaway*. New York: Dodd. Pp. 162.
Rev. in *HTB*, Nov. 10, p. 10.
- Pryce-Jones, Alan. "Hawthorne in England." *LL*, L, 71-80.
Based on (and amounts to a long review of) Randall Stewart's edition of Hawthorne's *English notebooks*.
- Sarzano, Frances. "Sir John Tenniel." *TLS*, Mar. 16, p. 127.
- Schilling, Bernard N. *Human dignity and the great Victorians*. Columbia univ. pr. Pp. xiii + 246.
A clear, compact, well-informed account of the condition-of-England problem and the attempts of Coleridge, Southey, Carlyle, Kingsley, Arnold, Ruskin, and Morris to solve it. The author regards these writers as forming a coherent movement of "literary humanitarians" holding common principles of "human dignity and the oneness of mankind," seeing a common danger in the suffering of the working classes, recognizing its intellectual cause in the naturalistic egotism of laissez faire, and proposing cures which begin with the medievalistic paternalism of Coleridge and Southey and culminate with the medievalistic aesthetic socialism of Morris. This book is intended to be elementary and introductory. It aims at intelligent summary rather than at critical analysis. Nevertheless, it would have gained in interest and depth had the author set his Victorians a little more elaborately in the framework of the history of ideas and considered them in relation to other criteria besides those of his study. One cannot do justice to Coleridge the literary humanitarian by studying him only, or even chiefly, as a literary humanitarian. Mr. Schilling has an excellent point. A common evil, a common enemy, and a common century and artistic tradition made these men, so dissimilar in many ways, into something like a unified group. Yet, one feels, their differences were grave and significant. In some respects Carlyle, for example, was as naturalistic as the Benthamites he opposed, and ideas like his led in the twentieth century to an attack more spectacular and perhaps more terrible than theirs on "human dignity." This book represents a good deal of reading and is accompanied by a very helpful series of bibliographical notes.—W. I.
- Septimus. "N. and Q.: History. I. Editors and assistants." "History. II. Its genesis." *N & Q*, June 29, pp. 275-76; Sept. 7, p. 101.
- Silberner, Edmund. *The problem of war in nineteenth-century economic thought*. Trans. Alex. H. Krappe. Princeton univ. pr. Pp. xiv + 332.
Rev. by G. D. H. Cole in *NS*, Sept. 21, p. 213; by G. A. Craig in *PSQ*, LXI, 448-49.
- Sitwell, Sir Osbert. *The scarlet tree*. Boston: Little, Brown. Pp. x + 381.
Rev. by Ernestine Evans in *HTB*, June 23, p. 4.
- Sitwell, Sir Osbert. "A Victorian boyhood: episodes from *The scarlet tree*." *AM*, CLXXVII, 86-91.
- Stevenson, Robert Scott. *Morell Mackenzie: the story of a Victorian tragedy*. London: Heinemann. Pp. 200.
Rev. by R. Partridge in *NS*, July 20, p. 50.
Mackenzie was the Victorian physician attendant on Crown Prince Frederick of Prussia; completely discredited, after Frederick's death, by German obloquy, by his own indiscreet response to criticism, and by the public condemnation of the British medical profession.—W. I.
- Viscountess Byng of Vimy. *Up the stream of time*. London: Macmillan, 1945. Pp. 274.
Rev. in *TLS*, Apr. 20, p. 184.
- Wilson, Thomas George. *Victorian doctor: being the life of Sir William Wilde*. New York: L. B. Fischer. Pp. 336.
Rev. by Richard Watts, Jr., in *HTB*, June 16, p. 2; by D. C. Russell in *NYTBR*, June 16, p. 6; by Jean C. S. Wilson in *SRL*, July 20, pp. 7-8. Biography of Sir William Wilde, the father of Oscar; invaluable for understanding the social and domestic forces that produced Oscar Wilde.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé Cecil. *Before the lamps went out*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. 256.

The English social scene from the 1880's to 1914.

III. MOVEMENTS OF IDEAS AND LITERARY FORMS; ANTHOLOGIES

Annan, Margaret C. "The Arabian nights in Victorian literature." *Summ. of doct. diss., Northwestern univ.*, XIII (1945), 5-8.

Anon. "The reading of the people in 1846." *JRLB*, XIX, 249.

Anon. "Twenty years with Aunt Judy." *TLS*, Dec. 7, p. i [of Children's Book section].

On *Aunt Judy's magazine* (1866-85).

Bentley, Eric. *The playwright as thinker: a study of drama in modern times*. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock. Pp. viii+382.

Rev. by Albert Guerard in *HTB*, July 28, p. 5; by Stark Young in *New R*, June 24, pp. 904-7. Includes much material on Shaw and somewhat less on Wilde and Yeats.

Ervine, St. John. "The Victorian theater." *FR*, CLX, 353-59.

Essays on the eighteenth century. Presented to David Nichol Smith in honor of his seventieth birthday. New York: Oxford univ. pr.

Rev. by S. C. Chew in *HTB*, Aug. 25, p. 20; by Thomas Lask in *NYTBR*, May 19, p. 22. Contains discussions of Addison's contribution to "Victorianism," Matthew Arnold's judgment of the eighteenth century, etc.

Fox, Ralph. *The novel and the people*. New York: International publishers, 1945. Pp. 128.

Rev. by John Bicknell in *Sci. & soc.*, X, 300-302. Published first in 1937 in England. Includes discussion of Victorian novelists. Intros. by Howard Fast and John Lehmann.

Freudenreich, Carl J. "Victorian novelists: their sales." *N & Q*, May 4, p. 193.

Gaunt, William. *The aesthetic adventure*. . . . See VB 1945, 266.

Rev. by Ruth Z. Temple in *QRL*, II (1945), 363-66.

Gohdes, Clarence. *American literature in nineteenth-century England*. . . . See VB 1945, 266.

Rev. by D. J. Gordon in *RES*, XXII, 250-51.

Grierson, H. J. C., and Smith, J. C. *A critical history of English poetry*. Oxford univ. pr. Pp. viii+593.

Rev. by Babette Deutsch in *HTB*, Dec. 1, p. 47; by Leonard Bacon in *SRL*, Dec. 7, p. 70.

Hinkley, Laura L. *Ladies of literature*. New York: Hastings.

Rev. by K. T. Willis in *LJ*, Dec. 15, p. 1805. Includes studies of Charlotte and Emily Brontë, Mrs. Gaskell, and George Eliot.

Hoxie, Elizabeth F. "Mrs. Grundie adopts Daisy Miller." *NEQ*, XIX, 474-84.

American arbiters of etiquette made James's heroine the model of ill-breeding; European writers, including Trollope and Ouida, made her the prototype for American girls in their own fiction.—W. I.

Johnson, David D. "Without benefit of clergy' in Victorian fiction." *W. Virginia univ. bull., philol. studies*, IV (1943), 15-21.

Mauer, Oscar. "Pope and the Victorians." *Studies in English by the Department of English, Univ. of Texas, 1944*. Austin: Univ. of Texas pr., 1945.

Maughan, David. "Victorianisms at Oxford." *TLS*, May 25, p. 247.

Morgan, Penelope E. "A few notes on the production of children's books to 1860." *N & Q*, Mar. 9, pp. 92-99; Mar. 23, pp. 113-15.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *A history of late nineteenth-century drama: 1850-1900*. 2 vols. Cambridge univ. pr. Pp. xi+772.

Rev. by St. John Ervine in *FR*, CLX, 353-59; in *N & Q*, Nov. 2, p. 198.

Pacey, Desmond. "Flaubert and his Victorian critics." *TQ*, XVI, 74-84.
Flaubert in England.

Peacock, Ronald. *Poet in the theatre*. New York: Harcourt. Pp. xi+163.

Rev. by W. P. Eaton in *HTB*, Nov. 3, p. 32; by B. D. in *NYTBR*, Oct. 6, p. 28; by Eric Bent-

ley in *ParR*, XIII, 596-98. Includes studies of Shaw, Synge, and Yeats.

Read, Herbert. "Max Stirner." *Adelphi*, XXII, 107-10.

The relation of Stirner to Marx, Nietzsche, Hartmann, Fromm, Sartre, and other thinkers.

Shaw, P. E. *The Catholic Apostolic Church sometimes called Irvingite*. New York: King's Crown pr. Pp. 264.

Rev. by M. E. Gaddis in *Church hist.*, XV, 311-13.

Smith, Robert Metcalf, and others. *The Shelley legend*. . . . See VB 1945, 267.

Rev. in *BSP*, XL, 81-83 ("With faults and virtues in an unhappy mixture, the book is nevertheless a guide post to Shelley scholarship"); by E. R. Bentley in *New R*, CXIV, 26-28.

Stebbins, Lucy Poate. *A Victorian album: some lady novelists of the period*. Columbia univ. pr. Pp. 10+226.

Rev. by K. T. Willis in *LJ*, Dec. 15, p. 1805.

Ullmann, Stephen de. "Anglicism and Anglophobia in Continental literature. II-C. The modern period (from 1815)." *Modern languages*, XXVII, 47.

Modern period of English influence is less homogeneous than eighteenth century. Vast number of English words exported to Continent; American contribution substantial. Use of English words in dialogue for local color or satire of affectation.—W. I.

Vulliamy, C. E. *Edwin & Eleanor: family documents, 1854-56*. Toronto: Ryerson pr., 1945. Pp. 231.

Vulliamy, C. E. *English letter writers*. London: Collins, 1945. Pp. 46.

Rev. by R. A. Scott-James in *S*, Jan. 4, p. 20. Includes Creevey, Charlotte Brontë, Queen Victoria, Fitzgerald, etc.

Wells, James M. "The artist in the English novel: 1850-1919." *W. Virginia univ. bull., philol. studies*, IV (1943), 77-80.

Wilbur, Earl Morse. *A history of unitarianism: socinianism and its antecedents*. Harvard univ. pr., 1945.

Rev. by R. H. Bainton in *Rev. of religion*, XI, 81-83.

IV. INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

Acton. Butterfield, H. "Journal of Lord Acton: Rome 1857." *CHJ*, VIII, 186-204.

Brief account of Acton's journals. Selections from 1857 journal.

Davies, W. W. "The politics of Lord Acton." *HJ*, XLV, 21-30.

Matthew, David. *Acton: the formative years*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Rev. by E. L. Woodward in *S*, Apr. 5, p. 352; in *TLS*, Apr. 27, p. 198.

Ainsworth. Parsons, Coleman O.; Micklewright, F. H. A. "Harrison Ainsworth's use of John Elwes in *The miser's daughter*." *N & Q*, Aug. 24, pp. 68-71; Nov. 16, p. 217.

Arnold (see also III, *Essays* . . .). Arnold, Matthew. *The poetical works*. With an introd. by Sir A. T. Quiller-Couch. Oxford univ. pr.; London: Cumberlege. Pp. xxii+494.

Rev. in *TLS*, Apr. 6, p. 162.

Curgenven, J. P. "Matthew Arnold in two scholarship examinations." *RES*, XXII, 54-56.

Dudley, Fred A. "Arnold's 'Shakespeare.'" *Ex*, IV, 57. (See also F. A. Philbrick's rejoinder in *V*, 24.)

Eisler, Robert. "Matthew Arnold." *TLS*, May 4, p. 211.

Jump, J. D. "Matthew Arnold and the *Saturday review*." *RES*, XXII, 322-24.

The *Saturday review's* lessening hostility toward Arnold's works after 1867 parallels the growth of his influence and his following.

Macdonald, Hugh. "Matthew Arnold." *TLS*, May 18, p. 235.

Parker, Eric. "Matthew Arnold." *TLS*, Apr. 27, p. 199.

Shelton, H. S. "Matthew Arnold and the modern church: a possible key to a difficult problem." *HJ*, XLIV, 119-24.

Steel, C. H. "Matthew Arnold." *TLS*, May 11, p. 223.

Barnes. Aspinall, A. "Thomas Barnes to Brougham: from friends to foes." *TLS*, July 27, p. 360.

Blunden. E. "Thomas Barnes." *TLS*, Aug. 3, p. 267.

Beardsley (see also I, Gallatin). Ironside, Robin. "Aubrey Beardsley." *Horizon*, XIV, 190-202.

Beerbohm. Boas, Guy. "The magic of Max." *Blackwood's*, CCLX, 341-50.

Blackmore. Etherington, Michael. "R. D. Blackmore." *New English rev.*, XIII, 298-306.

Includes two previously unpublished letters by Thomas Hardy.

Gill. W. W.; and M. "Words in Lorna Doone." *N & Q*, Oct. 19, pp. 156-59; Nov. 30, p. 240.

Linguistic peculiarities of the Exmoor characters.

Bradley. "F. H. Bradley: logician and metaphysician." *TLS*, Feb. 2, p. 54. Anniversary article.

Brontës (see also III, Hinkley, Vulliamy). B., E. G. "Branwell Brontë." *N & Q*, Jan. 12, pp. 21-22.

Birth dates of Anne and Branwell supplied in answer to query (see VB 1945, 268).

Brontë Society, Transactions and other publications of.

Vol. X, No. 5 (Part 54), has items: Andrews, W. L., "Is this film the real *Jane Eyre*?" (pp. 225-28); Childe, Wilfred R., "The literary background of the Brontës (pp. 204-8); Edgerley, C. Mabel, "The Brontë struggle against illness" (pp. 231-33); Edgerley, C. Mabel, "Mary Taylor, the friend of Charlotte Brontë" (pp. 214-21); Hopewell, Donald G., "Charlotte Brontë's writing desk" (pp. 201-3); Irish, George P., "Haworth pilgrimage" (pp. 209-13); Lemon, Charles H., "Another opinion of the film [*Jane Eyre*]" (pp. 229-30); Stanley, Beatrice E., "Change at Haworth" (pp. 222-24).

Vol. X, No. 6 (Part 55), has items: Edgerley, C. Mabel, "Charlotte Brontë as governess" (pp. 286-87); Edgerley, C. Mabel, "Ponden Hall and the Heatons" (pp. 265-68); MacCarthy, Des-

mond, "The Brontës in their books" (pp. 263-64); O., T., "Beginnings of the Brontë Society" (pp. 282-83); Olsen, Thomas, "The weary are at rest: a reconsideration of Branwell Brontë" (pp. 269-81); Spielmann, Percy E., "The Brontë-Heger mystery: a step towards its solution" (pp. 284-85); W., L.A., "Our greatest woman" (pp. 288-89).

Vol. XI, No. 1 (Part 56), has items: "Holly-wood and the Brontës [hostile notice of the film *Devotion*]" (pp. 38-39); C., M., "Memories of Ellen Nussey" (pp. 40-41); Edgerley, Dr. C., "Mrs. Brontës" (pp. 29-32); Greenwood, Emily, "Charlotte in Sunday school" (p. 43); Mair, Mary, "To Charlotte Brontë" (p. 39); Raleigh, H. M., "The broadcast version of *Jane Eyre*" (pp. 35-37); Ratchford, Fanny, "Texas adopts the Brontës" (pp. 33-34); Tas, Jeanne, "A Brontë circle in Holland" (pp. 42-43); Vaisey, The Hon. Mr. Justice, "*Wuthering Heights*: a note on its authorship [Branwell's hand in first four chapters]" (pp. 14-15); Ward, Barbara, "Charlotte Brontë and the world of 1846" (pp. 3-13); "The annual meeting [report of the reception of Miss Ward's address (see preceding item)]" (pp. 44-46); Weir, Edith M., "Cowan Bridge: new light from old documents [prospectus of and contemporary poem ridiculing the school are reprinted]" (pp. 16-28).

Dodds. M. H. "Anne Brontë and Robert Browning." *N & Q*, Feb. 23, pp. 81-82.

Similarity between Anne Brontë's "I dreamt last night" and Browning's "An Italian in England."

Hinkley. Laura L. *The Brontës, Charlotte and Emily*. . . . See VB 1945, 268.

Rev. by Harry Levin in *Amer. scholar*, XV, 245; by G. F. Whicher in *AM*, CLXVII, 170; in *HTB*, Jan. 13, p. 5; by Jean C. S. Wilson in *SRL*, Feb. 16, p. 17; by Gordon S. Haight in *YR*, XXXV, 546-50.

Does not contain much that is new on the subject but incorporates much Brontë scholarship; overvalues the influence of childhood experiences on the shaping of the Brontës' genius and in general indulges in dubious psychiatric deduction; maintains that Emily had probably finished a second novel (a study in degeneracy based on Branwell's life) before she died and that Charlotte destroyed it from a sense of pity.—C. F. H.

Lewis. Naomi. "Books in general." *NS*, Aug. 17, p. 119.

Analysis of Anne Brontë's *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*.

Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, June 22, p. 453.

Brief discussion of *Wuthering Heights*.

Brownings (see also II, Laird; **Brontës**: Dodds). Alington, C. A. "Browning and beauty." *TLS*, Apr. 13, p. 175.

Anon. "Poets of love: the two Brownings." *TLS*, Sept. 14, p. 438. See also Nov. 16, p. 563.

Centenary article on the Brownings' marriage, Sept. 12, 1846.

Browning, Elizabeth Barrett. "*Sonnets from the Portuguese*," avec une traduction en vers français et une introduction par André Maurois. New York: Brentano's, 1944. Pp. 133.

Rev. by R. D. Thomson in *Books abroad*, XX, 70-71.

Crosse, G.; and Orsini, N. "Casa Guidi." *N & Q*, June 1, p. 237; Sept. 21, p. 129.

Inscription commemorating Elizabeth Barrett Browning, on the wall of the Browning house in Florence.

Curle, Richard. "The Brownings." *TLS*, Nov. 2, p. 535.

Dodds, M. H. "*Sonnets from the Portuguese*, XVIII." *N & Q*, Nov. 2, p. 193. Query.

Duncan, Edgar H. "Browning's 'A toccata of Galuppi's.'" *Ex*, V, 5.

Dunsany, Lord. "Browning is Blougram." *NC*, CXXXIX, 175-77.

Memorabilist. [Comment on six lines from *The ring and the book*.] *N & Q*, Jan. 12, p. 1.

Priestley, F. E. L. "Blougram's apologetics." *TQ*, XV, 139-47.

Close, stimulating analysis, sympathetic to the bishop; makes clear Gigadibs' importance in the poem.—W. F.

Reese, Gertrude. "Robert Browning and his son." *PMLA*, LXI, 784-803.

Smith, Grover. "Petronius Arbiter and Elizabeth Barrett." *N & Q*, Nov. 2, p. 190.

Possible source of part of the opening poem in *Sonnets from the Portuguese*.

Watt, Margaret. "A famous elopement." *NR*, CLVII, 499-505.

A summary of the familiar romance.

Buckland. Annan, Noel. "Books in general." *NS*, Dec. 7, pp. 423-24.

Essay on Rev. Dr. William Buckland, Oxford professor of geology, and his son, Frank Buckland, the naturalist.

Bulwer-Lytton (see I, Parrish).

Butler. Anon. "Samuel Butler at Williams College." *TLS*, May 18, p. 240.

Holt, Lee Elbert. "E. M. Forster and Samuel Butler." *PMLA*, LXI, 804-19.

Forster's novels reveal that, like Butler, he emphasizes the importance of money and of instinctive wisdom, the effect of music on human nature, and the contrast between the carefree Italian and the restrained and hypocritical Englishman; that in such characters as Richie, Emerson, Mrs. Moore, and Fielding he has attempted portraits of Butler in various aspects. Cautious, convincing.—W. I.

Carleton. Bratton, Robert. "William Carleton." *TLS*, Apr. 20, p. 187.

Carlyle. Cassirer, Ernst. *The myth of the state*. Yale univ. pr. Pp. xii+303.

Rev. by James Gutmann in *NYTBR*, Nov. 10, p. 8. Considers Carlyle on the state.

Crow, Martin Michael. "The hero as desperado." *Libr. chron., univ. of Texas*, II, 3-16.

A contemporary American misinterpretation of Carlyle.

Goldberg, Maxwell H. "Carlyle, Pictet, and Jeffrey." *MLQ*, VII, 291-96.

Kirby, Thomas A. "Carlyle and Irving." *ELH*, XIII, 59-63.

Their attitudes toward each other. Contains a brief unpublished letter from Irving introducing Carlyle to a Birmingham parson. Otherwise unimportant.—A. W.

- Morgan, Warren M. "Carlyle's concept of democracy." *Univ. of Wisconsin summ. of doct. diss.*, VIII, 205-6.
- Munford, W. A. "Carlyle and the twentieth century." *LR*, No. 79 [fall], pp. 157-59.
- Colenso. Bagnall, A. G. "William Colenso." *TLS*, Oct. 26, p. 521.
Letter requesting Colenso's letters, etc.
- Coleridge. Griggs, Earl Leslie. "Four letters of Hartley Coleridge." *HLQ*, IX, 401-9.
Prints four letters not included in the collected *Letters of Hartley Coleridge* (London, 1936).
- Collins. McCleary, G. F. "A Victorian classic." *FR*, CLX, 137-41.
On *The Moonstone*.
- Conrad. Morris, Robert L. "The classical reference in Conrad's fiction." *CE*, VII, 312-18.
- Cory. Cory, Pixie. "In search of a grandfather." *Blackwood's*, CCLX, 263-67.
On William Cory.
- Darley. "The poet of solitude [George Darley]." *TLS*, Nov. 23, p. 580.
Centenary article on Darley's death, Nov. 23, 1846.
- Darwin. Barlow, Nora (ed.). *Charles Darwin and the voyage of the Beagle*. London: Pilot pr. Pp. 279.
Rev. by Harry Roberts in *S*, Mar. 15, pp. 276-78; in *TLS*, Mar. 16, p. 126. Unpublished letters and notebooks.
- Hubble, Douglas. "The evolution of Charles Darwin." *Horizon*, XIV, 74-85.
The influence of Darwin's father on his son's personality and achievement.
- De Tabley. Taplin, Gardner Blake. "The life, works, and literary reputation of John Byrne Leicester Warren, Lord De Tabley." *Summ. of theses, Harvard univ.*, 1942 (pub. 1946), pp. 290-92. Harvard univ. pr.
De Tabley (1834-95) "one of the most versatile of nineteenth-century poets."
- Dickens (see also I, Miller, Parrish; II, Laird; Eliot; Dodds; Trollope: *Trollopian*, Boll, Heilman). "Alain." *En lisant Dickens*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945.
Rev. by Una Pope-Hennessy in *Horizon*, XIV, 203-4.
- Anon. "The daily news and Charles Dickens." *JRLB*, XIX, 247-49.
- Becker, May Lamberton. "Friends of Dickens." *HTB*, Mar. 3, p. 30 (in "The reader's guide").
On the Dickens Fellowship.
- Becker, May Lamberton. "The Rochester mystery." *HTB*, Sept. 29, p. 31 (in "The reader's guide").
On *Edwin Drood*.
- Bentley, H. H. "Richard Bentley." *TLS*, Jan. 5, p. 7. See also Jan. 12, p. 19; Mar. 2, p. 103; Mar. 23, p. 139.
Concerning whether the publisher, Bentley, was financially just in his dealings with Dickens.
- C., T. C. "London place-names and men of letters." *N & Q*, Jan. 12, pp. 12-13; Feb. 9, p. 61.
Echoes of Dickens and Thackeray in London place names.
- D., C.; Parker, A.; Dodds, M. H. "My grandmother's needle." *N & Q*, Mar. 9, p. 101; Apr. 6, p. 151.
Query and reply about a phrase in *David Copperfield*.
- Dickensian* (quarterly), Vols. XLII-XLIII (Nos. 278-81). See VB 1932, 422.
Items as follows: Aytiman, P., "The importance of being Dickens" (XLIII, 24-25); Bromhill, K., "Dickens through Finnish spectacles [rev. of Rantavaara, *Dickens in the light of English criticism*]" (XLII, 148-49); Cotterell, T., "The original of Quilp" (XLIII, 39-40); Dean, F., "George Hogarth [father-in-law of Dickens]" (XLIII, 19-24); Dickens, Mary, "Dickens self-revealed" (XLII, 65-71, 129-33); Frewer, L., "From recent books" (XLII, 102-7, 158-62, 214-16; XLIII, 49-52); Gibson, F., "A French philosopher on Dickens [rev. of 'Alain,' *En lisant Dickens*]" (XLII, 134-37); Hill, T., "Betty [in *Our mutual friend*]" (XLIII, 41-42); Hill, T., "Notes on *Little Dorrit*" (XLII, 82-91); Hill, T., "Notes on *Martin Chuzzlewit*" (XLII, 141-48, 196-203; XLIII, 28-35); Major, Mrs. G., "Some

damage has been reported . . . [survey of damage done, 1939-45, by enemy air attacks, to every building having Dickensian associations]" (XLII, 92-97, 124-29, 207-13); Mason, L., "Dickens, Trollope and Joe Whelks" (XLII, 118-23, 174-80); Mason, L., "Poe-script [Dickens and E. A. Poe]" (XLII, 79-81); Miller, W., "Contemporary views of Dickens" (XLIII, 46-48); Morley, M., "Pickwick makes his stage debut" (XLII, 204-6); S., L. C., "The daily news centenary" (XLII, 78-79); S., L. C., "Dickens and Australian emigration" (XLII, 75-77); Summers, M., "Dickens and the decadent" (XLII, 61-64); "Uncollected speeches: XII, XIII, XIV, XV [reprinting of Dickens' speeches made at annual festivals of the Royal General Theatrical Fund, on, respectively, April 5, 1852; March 22, 1853; April 2, 1855; and March 17, 1856]" (XLII, 72-74, 137-40); Walsh, U., "Dickens on discs" (XLIII, 42-45); Williams, P., "In the beginning . . . [appreciation of the openings of the novels]" (XLII, 99-101); Yarre, d'A., "The bold Turpin [Sam Weller's song based on ballad by Horace and James Smith]" (XLIII, 12-13); Young, G. F., "Noddy Boffin's misers" (XLIII, 14-17).

Hopkins, Annette B. "Dickens and Mrs. Gaskell." *HLQ*, IX, 357-85.

Mrs. Gaskell was a contributor to *Household words* and *All the year round* for thirteen years. Dickens' letters to her throw light upon his methods as editor and critic and upon Mrs. Gaskell as a critic of her own work.

House, Humphry. "A Dickens shrine." *TLS*, Jan. 5, p. 7. See also Jan. 12, p. 19; Jan. 19, p. 31; Feb. 9, p. 67.

Orwell, George. *Dickens, Dali and others: studies in popular culture*. New York: Reynal. Pp. 243. (English title, *Critical essays*. London: Secker & Warburg.)

Rev. by J. W. Krutch in *HTB*, May 5, p. 5; by Wylie Sypher in *N*, May 25, p. 630; by Harry Levin in *New R*, May 6, p. 665; by V. S. Pritchett in *NS*, Feb. 16, p. 124; by R. G. Davis in *NYTBR*, May 19, p. 4; by Newton Arvin in *ParR*, XIII, 500-504; by Stuart Hampshire in *S*, Mar. 8, p. 250; by Eric Bentley in *SRL*, May 11, p. 11; in *TLS*, Feb. 23, p. 92. Includes articles on Dickens, Kipling, and Yeats.

Pope-Hennessy, Una. *Charles Dickens: 1812-1870*. . . . See VB 1945, 270.

Rev. in *Amer. merc.*, LXII, 630; by Clair McGlinchey in *CWd*, CLXIII, 280; by M. Dickens in

Dickensian, XLII, 65-71, 129-33; by M. L. Becker in *HTB*, Apr. 21, p. 4; by K. T. Willis in *LJ*, Mar. 15, p. 405; by Alastair Cooke in *New R*, Oct. 28, pp. 564-65; by P. W. Wilson in *NYTBR*, Apr. 21, p. 8; by Frederic Babcock in *SRL*, Apr. 13, p. 18.

Pope-Hennessy, Una. "Dickens and Bentley." *TLS*, Nov. 2, p. 535.

Price, Fanny. "An injustice to Dickens." *N & Q*, Sept. 21, pp. 146-47.

Rantavaara, Irma. *Dickens in the light of English criticism*. Helsinki univ. diss. Helsinki, 1944.

Rev. by K. Bromhill in *Dickensian*, XLII, 148-49 (praised; contains "the opinions of critics from 1836 . . . to the present").

Shettle, G. T. *Dickens and the church*. London: Churchman Pub. Co.

Brief rev. in *Dickensian*, XLIII, 35. Includes title essay and "Charles Dickens and nature."

Vandiver, Edward P., Jr. "Dickens' knowledge of Shakspeare." *Shak. assoc. bull.*, XXI, 124-28.

Takes issue with Wagenknecht's statement that Dickens knew Shakespeare "superficially." Offers brief (convincing) evidence that Dickens enjoyed and occasionally quoted Shakespeare; but (1) no definition of superficiality is offered, and (2) no attempt is made to compare Dickens' knowledge of Shakespeare with his knowledge of Jonson *et al.* (whom Wagenknecht implies he knew better).—W. F.

Wegelin, Christof. "Dickens and Irving: the problem of influence." *MLQ*, VII, 83-91.

Welpy, W. H.; Fellows, Reginald B.; Wulcko, Laurance M.; Mabbott, T. O. "Railway signals." *N & Q*, June 15, p. 260; July 13, p. 21; Aug. 10, pp. 64-65; Sept. 21, p. 129; Oct. 5, p. 152; Nov. 16, p. 218.

An apparent slip of the pen in *Our mutual friend*.

Wood, Frederick T. "Sam Weller's cockneyisms." *N & Q*, June 1, pp. 234-35.

Wood, Frederick T. "A tale of two cities analogy." *N & Q*, June 15, p. 259.

Disraeli. Edwards, Tudor. "Pugin at Alton Towers." *Dublin rev.*, CCXVIII, 73-79.

About the work of the architect at Alton Towers, the "Muriel Towers" of Lothair.

Douglas. Tredegar. "Lord Alfred Douglas." *TLS*, Mar. 16, p. 127.

Eliot (see also III, Hinkley). Bullett, Gerald. "George Eliot." *TLS*, Mar. 23, p. 139.

Dodds, M. H. "George Eliot and Charles Dickens." *N & Q*, Apr. 6, pp. 143-45.

Similarities between *Bleak house* and *Felix Holt*.

E., M. A. "George Eliot." *N & Q*, Feb. 9, p. 60.

Query.

Leavis, F. R. "Revaluations (XV): George Eliot." *Scrutiny*, XIII, 172-87; 257-71.

Parsons, Coleman O. "Background material illustrative of *Silas Marner*." *N & Q*, Dec. 28, pp. 266-70.

George Eliot's achievement is the complete development of a theme which before had appeared only "fragmentarily or with too little detail to attain full emotional force."

Fitzgerald (see III, Vulliamy).

Froude (see also **Trollope**: *The Trollopian*, Booth). V., M. E. "An injustice to Froude." *N & Q*, Feb. 23, p. 85. See VB 1945, 271.

Gaskell (see III, Hinkley; **Dickens**: Hopkins).

Gilbert. *Gilbert and Sullivan songs for young people: selected and arranged by Margaret Bush; intro. & notes by J. R. de la Torre Bueno, jr.; des. & il. by Erna M. Karolyi.* (Whittlesey house publication.) New York: McGraw. Pp. 71.

Rev. in *HTB*, May 19, p. 10; by E. M. Gordon in *LJ*, LXXI, 984; by Marjorie Fischer in *NYTBR*, June 16, p. 33.

Gissing. Paterson, James. "George Gissing." *TLS*, Oct. 19, p. 507.

Letter to ed., asking for correspondence of Gissing.

Webster, H. T. "Possible influence of George Gissing's *Workers in the dawn* on Maugham's *Of human bondage*." *MLQ*, VII, 315.

Gladstone. Eyck, E. "Bismarck and Gladstone." *CR*, CLXX, 343-48.

Green. Addison, W. G. *John Richard Green*. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. 96.

Rev. in *N & Q*, Nov. 16, p. 219.

Hardy (see also I, Parrish; II, Laird; **Blackmore**: Etherington). *Far from the madding crowd*, with introd. and notes by Carl J. Weber. Rev. ed. Oxford univ. pr.

The old clock. With a note by Carl J. Weber. Portland, Me.: Southworth-Anthoensen pr.

Probably the first American printing of Hardy's first (or first-known) poem.

"The thieves who couldn't help sneezing." Hardy's juvenile Christmas story reprinted in *Christmas tales for reading aloud*. Ed. Robert Lohan. New York: Stephen Daye pr.

Bailey, J. O. "Hardy's 'Mephistophelian visitants.'" *PMLA*, LXI, 1146-84.

An exhaustive analysis of the origins, traits, and roles of Sergeant Troy, Diggory Venn, William Dare, and similar characters, including the Spirit of Rumour and the spirits sinister and ironic in *The dynasts*. This type of character developed naturally as a dramatic device and is not to be thought of as contradicting Hardy's philosophical monism.—W. I.

Blunden, Edmund. "Thoughts of Thomas Hardy." Poem in *Shells by a stream*. New York: Macmillan.

Cecil, Lord David. *Hardy the novelist: an essay in criticism*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. See VB 1943, 421-22.

Rev. in *AM*, CLXXXVIII, 160-61; by Bergen Evans in *Book week*, Sept. 15, p. 6; by G. F. Whicher in *HTB*, Sept. 1, p. 5; by Alexander Cowie in *NYTBR*, Sept. 15, p. 36; by F. B. Adams, Jr., in *SRL*, Sept. 28, pp. 10-11; by H. E. Woodbridge in *YR*, XXXVI, 376-77.

Chapple, Joe Mitchell. "As I remember Thomas Hardy." *Christian sci. mon.*, magazine sec., Jan. 26, p. 5.

Ferguson, DeLancey. "Hardy's 'In time of 'The breaking of nations.''" *Ex*, IV, 25.

Flower, Sir Newman. "Walks and talks with Thomas Hardy." *Countryman*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2.

Gierasch, Walter. "Hardy's 'In tenebris, I.'" *Ex*, IV, 45.

Parker, Eileen. "The regionalism of Thomas Hardy." *New Saxon rev.*, No. 4, pp. 17-22.

Sassoon, Siegfried. "Siegfried among the nightingales." *AM*, CLXXVII, 85-90.

Includes memories of Hardy.

Sassoon, Siegfried. *Siegfried's journey: 1916-1920*. New York: Viking. Pp. 338.

Much comment on Hardy.

Sherman, George W. "Thomas Hardy and the lower animals." *Prairie schooner*, XX, 304-9. Univ. of Nebraska pr.

Weber, Carl J. "A most desirable association item." *Colby libr. quart.*, I, 201-8.

Mrs. Patrick Campbell's Kelmscott Press gift-book to Hardy.

Weber, Carl J. "Deep in the heart of China." *Colby libr. quart.*, I, 208-9.

A Japanese translation of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*.

Weber, Carl J. *Hardy in America: a study of Thomas Hardy and his American readers*. Waterville, Me.: Colby college pr. Pp. x+321.

Rev. by Alexander Cowie in *NYTBR*, Sept. 15, p. 36; by F. B. Adams, Jr., in *SRL*, Sept. 28, pp. 10-11; in *TLS*, July 20, p. 343.

In 1940 appeared Professor Weber's *Hardy of Wessex: his life and literary career*; this book dealt with Hardy from birth to death. Two years later he published *The first hundred years of Thomas Hardy . . .*, a bibliography. The present volume is a sequel to *Hardy of Wessex*. It undertakes to examine the process by which Hardy has become in America "one of the great spiritual leaders." It is concerned, he says, as much with the men and women who live in America as with the books that were penned in Wessex. It endeavors to deal with Hardy in America, past, present, and future. The treatment of the future is unexpected in a book of this sort, and Mr. Weber explains by saying that Hardy has been such a great influence in America in the past that it is advisable for us to consider and interpret his

qualifications as counselor and guide in the future.

One striking conclusion to be drawn from this book is that America had a notable effect upon Hardy (see, e.g., pp. 72, 87, 105, 121, 210, 211). Mr. Weber properly gives much space to American publishers, editors, magazines, and newspapers: "It may be doubted whether any other English author has ever had so much 'promotion' lavished upon him." He devotes space also to the attention paid Hardy by American reviewers and professional critics; by certain influential American women; by teachers and students in our colleges and universities; by American novelists, poets, and social philosophers; and by the general reading public. This is a study of Hardy's American history, and Mr. Weber intentionally has relatively little to say about the artistic quality or the "purely" literary value of Hardy's works. Such criticism he presented within *Hardy of Wessex*. Looking at the history of American campus activity with Hardy, he makes three deductions: (1) there is need for more careful attention to biographical fact; (2) there is need for more critical concern for Hardy's text; and (3) there is great need for clarity and precision in the use of philosophical terms. He declares, as he looks at Hardy's appeal to the common reader in America, that "from 1873 to the present, all classes and every degree of education and intelligence have responded to his books." The present reviewer, though without statistics, hesitates to agree that Hardy has had and still has the direct influence upon the masses in America that Mr. Weber indicates. As for the poet Hardy in America, the book presents two chapters that deserve wide reading, especially the second.

The book has excellent documentation and indexing, a list of Hardy manuscripts in America, and a notable annotated bibliography (pp. 273-88) listing Hardy's titles under the many various American publishers of items by Hardy. No volume of Hardy letters has been published; hence some of the value of this book lies in its publication of many letters by Hardy and by his American correspondents. The critical evaluation of the collected editions of Hardy (p. 98) is very useful.

Mr. Weber finds that America has considered Hardy immensely influential and states (p. 3) that if "we discover that America has found in Hardy's books something more than he, perhaps, consciously put into them, that discovery need not disturb us." Yet he is disturbed—and defensibly—that so many Americans have considered Hardy a pessimist (cf. esp. chaps. xii, xvi,

xvii). He has done much effective special pleading for Hardy as meliorist, and no future editor or student wishing to make public announcement about Hardy can afford to be unaware of this book. The most convincing single detail, for me, that shows Hardy to be other than a pessimist and a fatalist is the one highlighted by Mr. Weber in his last chapter: Hardy declared that in a story like *Jude* "there is something the world ought to be shown, and I am the one to show it to them."

Mr. Weber has previously published many fragmentary reports on Hardy in America. Here he gathers together coherently and usefully the results of much investigation by himself and by others. He writes with such clear, broadminded, and well-ornamented insistence that in my opinion he will win over many readers to share his high appreciation of Hardy. According to him, Hardy in America has effected an enhancement of life; by his careful presentation and universalized interpretation of his findings, Mr. Weber will effect an enhancement of Hardy. He has written a book for reference, for pleasure, and for pondering—W. D. Templeman.

Weber, Carl J. "Jude from obscurity via notoriety to fame." *Colby libr. quart.*, I, 209-15.

With a fiftieth-anniversary bibliography of *Jude the obscure*.

Weber, Carl J. "The manuscript of Hardy's *Two on a tower*." *BSP*, XL, 1-21.

Evidence that Mrs. Hardy acted as amanuensis for her husband, not as collaborator.

Wicks, F. C. S. "Thomas Hardy, the unlabeled." *Humanist*, VI, 66.

Haydon. "Haydon's tragedy." *TLS*, June 22, p. 295. (Anniversary editorial.) See also July 6, p. 319 (letter to ed. by Kenmare Dallas).

Henley. Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. "William Ernest Henley, Victorian activist." *Summ. of theses, Harvard univ.*, 1942 (pub. 1946), pp. 261-65. Harvard univ. pr.

Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. *William Ernest Henley*. . . . See VB 1945, 271.

Rev. by G. F. Whicher in *HTB*, May 19, p. 38; by J. C. R. in *KR*, VIII, 338-39; by H. M. McLuhan in *MLQ*, VII, 368-70; by E. R. Bentley in *New R*, CXIV, 26-28.

Hood. *Letters of Thomas Hood: from the Dilke papers*. . . . Ed. L. A. Marchand. See VB 1945, 271.

Rev. by Richard D. Altick in *MLQ*, VII, 366-67.

Hopkins. *Selections from the note-books of Gerard Manley Hopkins*. Ed. T. Weiss. New York: New directions, 1945.

Kenyon review. Gerard Manley Hopkins, by the *Kenyon critics*. ("Makers of modern literature.") New York: New directions.

Most of the essays in this volume were first published in the *Kenyon review*, Vol. VI, Nos. 3 and 4. See VB 1944, 243-44.

Rev. in *Book week*, Feb. 3, p. 2; by M. Meagher in *CWd*, CLXIII, 181; by B. Deutsch in *HTB*, Mar. 17, p. 12; by D. Schwartz in *N*, Mar. 23, p. 347; by M. Mack in *YR*, XXV, 539-42.

Housman (see also I, Stallman). *A Shropshire lad*. With notes and a bibliography by Carl J. Weber. ("Jubilee edition.") Waterville, Me.: Colby college libr.

Rev. by William White in *BSP*, XL, 243-45; in *TLS*, Mar. 30, p. 1; by R. W. Stallman in *QRL*, III, 189-93 (this review, called "A Shropshire lad at fifty," is really a criticism of Housman's poetry).

Connolly, Cyril. *The condemned playground: essays, 1927-1944*. New York: Macmillan. Pp. xiii+287.

Rev. by Kenneth Rockwell in *Book week*, July 14, p. 5; by J. W. Krutch in *HTB*, July 14, p. 1; by Wylie Sypher in *N*, Aug. 3, p. 130; by Harry Levin in *New R*, July 15, p. 49; by Brian Howard in *NS*, Dec. 29, p. 443; by D. A. Stauffer in *NYTBR*, July 28, p. 6; by R. E. Roberts in *SRL*, July 13, p. 7; by Stuart Hampshire in *S*, Dec. 14, p. 572; in *TLS*, Dec. 1, 1945, p. 573. Includes "A. E. Housman: a controversy."

Ghiselin, Brewster. "Housman's 'The oracles.'" *Ex*, IV, 33.

Lynskey, Winifred. "Housman's 'Loveliest of trees.'" *Ex*, IV, 59.

Scott, Wilbur S. "Housman's 'Farewell to barn and stack and tree.'" *Ex*, V, 11.

Werner, W. L. "Housman's 'Loveliest of trees.'" *Ex*, V, 4.

- Hurnard.** Hamilton, G. Rostrevor (ed.). *James Hurnard, a Victorian character, being extracts from "The setting sun."* Cambridge univ. pr.
- Rev. in *N & Q*, Aug. 10, p. 66; by G. W. Stonier in *NS*, July 6, p. 11; by C. E. Vulliamy in *S*, Nov. 15, p. 524.
- Passages from *The setting sun*, a 10,000-line blank-verse poem by a Victorian brewer, whose poem ran to three editions and is now very rare; a "stream of talk . . . lively, vigorous, with tart humor and homely vividness . . . crotchets that transport one to those remote Victorian days . . . politics, personalities, machines, inventions, arts, recreations, domesticities"—a first-rate period piece.—C. F. H.
- W., L. M. "James Hurnard." *N & Q*, Sept. 7, p. 109.
- Jefferies.** Looker, Samuel J. (ed.). *Richard Jefferies: a tribute.* By various writers. Worthing: Aldridge bros.
- Jeffrey** (see also **Carlyle**: Goldberg). Derby, J. Raymond. "The paradox of Francis Jeffrey: reason versus sensibility." *MLQ*, VII, 489-500.
- Kingsley** (see I, Parrish).
- Kipling** (see also **Dickens**: Orwell). Brown, Hilton. *Rudyard Kipling: a new appreciation.* . . . See VB 1945, 272.
- Rev. in *AM*, CLXXVII, 162; by J. Hilton in *HTB*, Jan. 27, p. 3; by A. R. Eaton in *LJ*, Jan. 15, p. 119; in *New R*, Mar. 25, p. 422; by E. K. Brown in *YR*, XXXV, 740-42.
- Whitbread, L., "'Oak, ash and thorn.'" *N & Q*, Oct. 5, p. 146.
- Possible source of an idea in Kipling.
- Lang.** Green, Roger Lancelyn. *Andrew Lang: a critical biography.* Leicester: Edmund Ward.
- Rev. by R. Jennings in *NS*, Nov. 9, p. 341; by Anthony Powell in *S*, Nov. 1, p. 460; in *TLS*, Nov. 30, p. 590 (see also Dec. 14, p. 615).
- Lecky.** Auchmuty, J. J. *Lecky: a biographical and critical study.* London: Longmans. Pp. 134.
- Rev. in *N & Q*, Oct. 19, p. 175. On the historian W. E. H. Lecky
- Lewes.** "Mary Shelley and G. H. Lewes." *TLS*, Jan. 12, p. 24.
- Lockhart.** Strout, Alan L. "Lockhart's quotations." *N & Q*, Sept. 7, p. 104.
- Strout, Alan Lang. "Some unpublished letters of John Gibson Lockhart to John Wilson Croker." *N & Q*, Mar. 9, pp. 90-92; Mar. 23, pp. 115-18; Apr. 20, pp. 161-64; May 4, pp. 180-83; May 18, pp. 210-12; June 1, pp. 232-34; June 15, pp. 244-45. See VB 1945, 272.
- Lytton.** Harlan, Aurelia. *Owen Meredith: a critical biography of Robert, first Earl of Lytton.* ("Studies in English and comp. lit.," No. 163.) Columbia univ. pr.; London: Cumberlege. Pp. ix+292.
- Rev. in *Current hist.*, X, 539; in *HTB*, Mar. 24, p. 10; by R. Humphries in *N*, May 18, p. 605; by A. Vrooman in *NYTBR*, Mar. 17, p. 18; by R. E. Roberts in *SRL*, June 8, p. 20; in *TLS*, Aug. 3, p. 266.
- Macaulay.** Freemantle, A. F. "Wisdom of Macaulay." *NC*, CXL, 336-38.
- Graham, D. Malise. "The Highlands of those other days." *QR*, CCLXXXIV, 430-44.
- Sources of Macaulay's picture of the Scottish Highlands.
- Massey.** Trawick, Buckner Beasley. "The works of Gerald Massey." *Summ. of theses, Harvard univ.*, 1942 (pub. 1946), pp. 293-97. Harvard univ. pr.
- Massey (1828-1907) is called "an important and representative man of letters in his own day."
- Meredith.** Dunsany, Lord. "George Meredith." *NC*, CXXXIX, 32-35.
- Ekeberg, Gladys W. "The ordeal of Richard Feverel as tragedy." *CE*, VII, 387-93.
- Little more than a re-examination of the plot of the novel.—A. W.
- Going, William J. "A note on 'My lady' of *Modern love*." *MLQ*, VII, 311-14.
- A correction of the too literal interpretation of Meredith's poem in autobiographical terms.
- Mill.** Hains, J. R. "John Stuart Mill and the Saint Simonians." *JHI*, VII, 103-12.

- Hough, Graham. "Books in general." *NS*, Nov. 16, p. 361.
- Discussion of Mill's education: nothing new.—W. I.
- Kohn, Hans. *Prophets and peoples: studies in nineteenth-century nationalism*. New York: Macmillan. Pp. 213.
- Chapter i (pp. 12-42) is on J. S. Mill, the other chapters being on Michelet, Mazzini, Treitschke, and Dostoevsky. Excellent discussion of Mill's political ideas and their bearing on the present day. Also involves John Morley and Frederic Harrison.—W. F.
- Mitford. Ed. "R. H. Horne on Miss Mitford, after forty years." *N & Q*, Mar. 9, p. 101.
- Roberts, W. J. "Mary Russell Mitford: a bust." *N & Q*, Mar. 9, p. 103.
- Morley (see also Mill: Kohn). Knickerbocker, F. W. *Free minds: John Morley and his friends*. . . . See VB 1945, 272.
- Rev. by Francis W. Hirst in *CR*, CLXIX, 126-27; by J. L. Hammond in *FR*, No. 950, new ser., pp. 136-37; in *TLS*, Jan. 5, p. 9.
- Morris. Anderson, Karl Oscar Emanuel. "Scandinavian elements in the works of William Morris." *Summ. of theses, Harvard univ.*, 1942 (pub. 1946), pp. 258-61. Harvard univ. pr.
- Grennan, Margaret Rose. *William Morris: medievalist and revolutionary*. . . . See VB 1945, 272.
- Rev. by R. E. E. Harkness in *Crozer quart.*, XXIII, 187; by J. J. Reilly in *CWd*, CLXII, 471; by Hill Shine in *JMH*, XVIII, 358-59; by P. F. Baum in *SAQ*, XLV, 245-46; in *TLS*, Jan. 19, p. 30.
- Hough, Graham. "Books in general." *NS*, Nov. 30, p. 401.
- General discussion of Morris as an improver of taste.
- Litzenberg, Karl. "William Morris and the 'literary' tradition." *Michigan alumnus*, LIII, No. 10 (quarterly rev.), 48-55.
- Newman. Elliott-Binns, E. "Newman decides." *TLS*, Jan. 19, p. 31. See VB 1945, 274.
- Harrold, Charles Frederick. *John Henry Newman: an expository and critical study of his mind, thought and art*. . . . See VB 1945, 272-73.
- Rev. by W. O. Aydelotte in *AHR*, LI, 498; by C. H. Moehlman in *Christian cent.*, Mar. 6, p. 303; by F. J. Moore in *Churchman*, Feb. 1, p. 15; by A. S. Ryan in *MLQ*, VII, 367-68; by Philip Hallet in *MLR*, XLI, 435-36; by E. R. Bentley in *New R*, CXIV, 26-28.
- Horne, Ethelbert. "Swerga." *TLS*, May 11, p. 223. See also May 18, p. 235.
- Newman's use of the word in *Difficulties of Anglicans*.
- Horton-Smith, L. G. H. "The pillar of the cloud." *N & Q*, Feb. 23, p. 75; Apr. 20, pp. 171-72.
- R. H. Horton-Smith's Latin translation of Newman's poem.
- Houghton, Walter Edwards. *The art of Newman's "Apologia"*. . . . See VB 1945, 273-74.
- Rev. by J. J. Reilly in *CWd*, CLXIII, 182; in *Christian cent.*, Jan. 30, p. 145; by F. J. Moore in *Churchman*, Mar. 15, p. 15; by R. I. in *KR*, VIII, 340-41.
- John Henry Newman: centenary essays*. . . . See VB 1945, 274.
- Rev. in *TLS*, Jan. 5, p. 8.
- Lamborn, E. A. Greening. "Newman's church at Littlemore." *N & Q*, Jan. 26, pp. 46-49.
- Moody, John. *John Henry Newman*. . . . See VB 1945, 274.
- Rev. by W. O. Aydelotte in *AHR*, LI, 498; by G. G. Atkins in *Church hist.*, XV, 142-43; by C. F. Harrold in *MP*, XLIII, 213; by E. R. Bentley in *New R*, CXIV, 26-28; by Raymond Mortimer in *NS*, Mar. 16, p. 196; by John Sparrow in *S*, Mar. 29, p. 328.
- Simon, Paul. "Newman and German Catholicism." *Dublin rev.*, CCXIX, 75-84.
- A tribute to Newman: essays on aspects of his life and thought*. Ed. Michael Tierny. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. Pp. vi+360.
- Rev. in *TLS*, Jan. 5, p. 8.
- Patmore. Eaton, Vincent T. "The first Mrs. Patmore." *CWd*, CLXIV, 53-56.

Price, Fanny. "Patmore: a mystification." *N & Q*, Apr. 6, pp. 145-46.

Potter, Lane, Margaret. *The tale of Beatrice Potter: a biography*. New York: Warne. Pp. 192.

Rev. by M. A. Ayres in *Book week*, Nov. 10, p. 4; by M. L. Becker in *HTB*, Dec. 1, p. 6; by R. Mortimer in *NS*, Aug. 3, p. 84; by G. Freeman in *S*, July 12, p. 42; in *TLS*, Aug. 3, p. 369.

Reade, Burns, Wayne; and Sutcliffe, E. G. "Uncle Tom and Charles Reade." *AL*, XVII, 334-37.

MacMahon, Donald Hutchins. "The composition and early stage history of *Masks and faces*." *Research studies of the state college of Washington*, XIV, 251-70.

A study of the only surviving play by Charles Reade.

Sutcliffe, E. G. "Charles Reade in his heroes." *Trollopian*, No. 2, pp. 3-15.

Rossetti, Masfield, John. *Thanks before going: notes on some of the original poems of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*. London. Pp. 76.

Rev. in *TLS*, May 18, p. 236.

Ruskin. Anon. "Ruskin and Effie Gray. I. Extracts from an unpublished correspondence." *Cornhill mag.*, winter, pp. 163-78.

Extracts from letters written by Ruskin to Euphemia Gray, after their betrothal, in 1847 and 1848. These letters reveal Ruskin's deep affection for the girl who was soon to become his wife and also "throw a vivid light on the writer's psychology and anticipate some of the rhythms and cadence of his finished prose-work [prefatory note]." Important.—A. W.

Anon. "Ruskin at the Lyceum." *TLS*, June 8, p. 276.

Jennings, Richard. "Ruskin revived" and "A Victorian prophet." *NC*, CXXXIX, 179-80.

Livingstone, R. W. *Ruskin*. . . . See VB 1945, 275.

Rev. in *TLS*, Jan. 19, p. 30. See also Feb. 9, p. 67.

Reilly, Joseph J. "Ruskin on love and marriage." *CWd*, CLXIV, 232-39.

Saintsbury. *George Saintsbury. The memorial volume*. . . . See VB 1945, 275.

Rev. by C. J. Sisson in *MLR*, XLI, 332-33.

Shaw (see also III, Bentley, Peacock). *Selected novels of G. Bernard Shaw*. Introd. by Arthur Zeiger. Caxton House.

Rev. by "Bookwright" in *HTB*, Oct. 6, p. 35.

Bentley, Eric. "Bernard Shaw's politics (a birthday tribute)." *KR*, VIII, 347-71.

Corrects certain misconceptions concerning Shaw's politics. Credits Shaw with having arrived over sixty years ago at the same conclusions reached by the most enlightened of contemporary socialists.

Irvine, William. "G. B. Shaw's musical criticism." *Musical quart.*, XXXII, 319-32.

Jennings, Richard. "Nearly Methuselah" and "Shaw v. Shakespeare." *NC*, CXL, 39-40.

Loewenstein, F. E. "Mr. Bernard Shaw regrets. . . ." *Amer. merc.*, LXIII, 174-76.

Form replies prepared by Shaw to meet frequently recurring requests from correspondents.

Martin, Kingsley. "Homage to G. B. S." *NS*, July 27, pp. 62-63.

Shaw, Bernard. "Sixty years as an author." *Amer. merc.*, LXII, 32-36. Reprinted from *The author, playwright and composer* (1945).

Financial arrangements between author and publisher in the 1880's and at the present time.

Winsten, S. (ed.). *G. B. S. 90: aspects of Bernard Shaw's life and work*, by Max Beerbohm [and others]. New York: Dodd. Pp. 271.

Rev. in *Amer. merc.*, LXIII, 375; by Bergen Evans in *Book week*, Aug. 4, p. 5; by Vincent Sheean in *HTB*, July 28, p. 1; by Michael Sadleir in *NC*, CXL, 62-66; in *NYTBR*, July 28, p. 3; by Harrison Smith in *SRL*, July 27, p. 11; by Walter Allen in *S*, July 19, p. 68.

Shorthouse, Hough, Graham. "Books in general." *NS*, Aug. 3, pp. 83-84.

Brief account of J. L. Shorthouse's *John Inglesant*.

Stevenson, Fisher, Anne B. *No more a stranger*. Palo Alto: Stanford univ. pr. Pp. 265.

- Rev. by Jean C. S. Wilson in *SRL*, June 8, p. 33.
- An account of Stevenson's stay in California in the autumn months of 1879; uneven and at times misleading; somewhat Stracheyesque in approach and not very penetrating as a character study.—C. F. H.
- J., W. H.; Speaight, George. "Stevenson: 'The bottle imp': magic articles granting wishes." *N & Q*, Oct. 19, p. 169; Nov. 16, p. 218.
- Parsons, Coleman O. "Stevenson's interest in tableau." *N & Q*, Apr. 6, pp. 134-35.
- Somewhat fanciful examination of the "rather complex origin" of Stevenson's interest in tableau.—A. W.
- Parsons, Coleman O. "Stevenson's use of witchcraft in 'Thrawn Janet.'" *SP*, XLIII, 551-71.
- Scott, J. D. "R. L. Stevenson and J. D. Brown; the myth of Lord Braxfield." *Horizon*, XIII, 298-310.
- Critical comparison of Stevenson's *Weir of Hermiston* and Brown's *House with the green shutters*.
- Swinburne, Grantham, Evelyn. "Letters from Symonds to Swinburne." *More books: bull. Boston pub. libr.*, XXI, 212-21.
- Legman, G.; T., C. "Bowdler." *N & Q*, May 18, p. 215; June 29, p. 285.
- A defense of Bowdler by Swinburne.
- Tennyson. *A selection from the poems of Tennyson*. Selected and with introd. by W. H. Auden. . . . See VB 1945, 275.
- Rev. by R. Mortimer in *NS*, Dec. 28, pp. 486-87.
- Basler, Roy P. "Tennyson's 'Ulysses.'" *Ex*, IV, 48.
- Carew, Peter. "One of the 'Six Hundred.'" *Blackwood's*, CCLIX, 40-50.
- Account of experiences of Captain Robert Portal, who participated in the famous charge at Balaklava.
- Frost, William. "Tennyson's 'Ulysses.'" *Ex*, IV, 48.
- Fuson, Ben. W. "Tennyson's 'In memoriam, XI.'" *Ex*, IV, 34.
- Lucas, F. L. "Croker and Tennyson." *TLS*, Nov. 30, p. 596. See also Dec. 14, p. 615.
- M., T. W.; Strachan, L. R. M.; A., T. "Tennyson: identifications wanted." *N & Q*, Apr. 6, p. 146; May 4, p. 196.
- Walcutt, Charles C. "Tennyson's 'Ulysses.'" *Ex*, IV, 28.
- Waterfield, A. J. "The booksale." *N & Q*, Jan. 12, pp. 14-15.
- Tennyson association volumes acquired at the sale of surplus volumes from the Isle of Wight home of the Tennysons in June, 1929.
- Thackeray (see also Dickens: C., T. C.). Anon. "Enter Becky Sharp." *TLS*, Jan. 4, 1947.
- Editorial on centenary of the publication of the first of the twenty yellow-covered parts of *Vanity fair*, Jan. 1, 1847.
- Brogan, Howard O. "Rachel Esmond and the dilemma of the Victorian ideal of womanhood." *ELH*, XIII, 223-32.
- Thackeray's treatment of Rachel shows his perception "that the intense concentration upon domestic affections required by Victorian morality inevitably resulted in selfish possessiveness."
- MacCarthy, Desmond. "Thackeray at Weimar." *TLS*, July 20, p. 343.
- Ray, Gordon N. (ed.) *The letters and private papers of William Makepeace Thackeray*. 4 vols. Harvard univ. pr. Pp. clxxiii+522; viii+853; viii+695; x+586. See VB 1945, 276.
- Rev. by J. B. Brebner in *AHR*, LI, 499-501; by Edward Weeks in *AM*, CLXXVII, 156; by Harry Levin in *Amer. scholar*, XV, 245; by B. I. Evans in *CR*, CLXX, 277-80; in *DUJ*, XXXIX, 39-41; by G. F. Whicher in *HTB*, Jan. 5, 1947, p. 5; by Michael Sadleir in *NC*, CXL, 50-54; by R. Mortimer in *NS*, Sept. 21, p. 209; by Carlos Baker in *NYTBR*, Dec. 29, pp. 1, 17; in *QR*, CCLXXXIV, 537-38; by Bonamy Dobrée in *S*, Aug. 23, p. 196; by Gordon S. Haight in *SRL*, Feb. 8, 1947, pp. 10-12; in *YR*, XXXV, 546-50; by Joseph W. Beach in *VQR*, XXII, 280-95.
- Scudder, Harold H. "Thackeray and Sir Martin Archer Shee." *PMLA*, LXI, 202-10.
- Shee is perhaps the original of Mr. Smee in the forty-second chapter of *Vanity fair*.

Sochaczewer, H. "Thackeray and Goethe." *TLS*, July 6, p. 319.

Trollope (see also I, Parrish; III, Hoxie; **Dickens**: *Dickensian*, Mason). Trollope, Anthony. *An autobiography*, with introd. by Charles Morgan. London: Williams & Norgate. Pp. 319.

Rev. by Derek Hudson in *NR*, CXXVII, 76-79.

A., T. "Trollope: an unanswered query." *N & Q*, May 4, p. 193.

Booth, Bradford. "Trollope's letters." *TLS*, June 22, p. 295.

Bosher, Robert S. "Barchester renaissance." *Holy Cross mag.*, LVI (Dec., 1945), 366-68.

Bowen, Elizabeth. *Anthony Trollope: a new judgment*. Oxford univ. pr. Pp. 35.

Rev. by Derek Hudson in *NR*, CXXVII, 76-79.

Rather a popularization than a "new judgment." Attractively illustrated (map of Barsetshire, facsimile page from *Autobiography*, etc.). Bibliography (of the novels and collections of stories only).—W. F.

Brash, W. Bardsley. "Triumph of Anthony Trollope." *LQHR*, CLXX (July, 1945), 293-99.

Chapman, R. W. "A Trollope character." *TLS*, Oct. 19, p. 507. See also Nov. 9, p. 549.

Concerning "Madam Max."

Etherington, Michael. "Anthony Trollope and the clergy." *Guardian*, Jan. 4, p. 7.

Latymer. "Trollope's lost children." *TLS*, Jan. 19, p. 31. See also Jan. 26, p. 43; Feb. 2, p. 55; Feb. 9, p. 67; Mar. 2, p. 103; Mar. 16, p. 127; Mar. 23, p. 139.

Memorabilist. [Comment on Trollope and *The Trollopian*]. *N & Q*, Feb. 23, p. 67.

Morgan, Charles. "Trollope today." *AM*, CLXXVII, 125-27.

Pritchett, V. S. "Books in general." *NS*, June 8, p. 415.

Brief article on Trollope.

Stebbins, Lucy P.; and Stebbins, Richard P. *The Trollopes: the chronicle of a writing family*. . . . See VB 1945, 276.

Rev. by Harry Levin in *Amer. scholar*, XV, 245; by A.M. in *KR*, VIII, 337-38; by B. A. Booth in *MLN*, LXI, 353-54; by E. R. Bentley in *NR*, CXIV, 26-28; by Lettice Fowler in *S*, Aug. 23, pp. 198, 200; in *TLS*, July 20, p. 344; by Hugh G. Dick in *The Trollopian*, No. 2, pp. 27-32; by G. S. Haight in *YR*, XXXV, 546-50.

The Trollopian (semiannually). See VB 1945, 276.

No. 2 (March) has items: "Sir Edward Marsh's emendation [of *Dr. Thorne*]" (p. 49); "Barrie and Trollope" (p. 49); "Trollope's collection of annotated novels" (pp. 49-50); "Work in progress" (p. 50); "Books for sale" (p. 50); Booth, Bradford A., "Trollope on Froude's *Caesar*" (pp. 33-47); Box, H. Oldfield, "Trollope on the radio" (pp. 23-25); Dick, Hugh G., "The Trollopes [by the Stebbinses] reviewed [as a chronicle of the family . . . stimulating. . . . On the other hand, their interpretation of Anthony is all Danaë to attack]" (pp. 27-32); Wildman, John H., "About Trollope, in a postwar mood" (pp. 17-22).

No. 3 (Sept.) has items: "New editions of Trollope" (p. 55); "Current bibliography [of Trollope studies]" (pp. 55-56); "Research in progress [covering Victorian fiction generally]" (pp. 56-57); "A census of Trollope manuscripts" (pp. 57-58); Boll, Ernest, "The infusions of Dickens in Trollope" (pp. 11-24); Green, Gladys, "Trollope on Sidney's *Arcadia* and Lytton's *The wanderer* [a transcription of Trollope's annotations in his own copies of these works]" (pp. 45-54); Heilman, Robert B., "The new world in Charles Dickens's writings (part one)" (pp. 25-43); Taylor, Robert H., "Letters to Trollope [description of a portfolio, preserved by Rose Trollope, of several letters from Victorian celebrities to Trollope]" (pp. 5-9); Tinker, Chauncey B., "Newton's Trollope society" (pp. 1-3).

Vincent, C. J. "Trollope: a Victorian Augustan." *QQ*, LII (1945), 415-28.

Wildman, John H. "Anthony Trollope today." *CE*, VII, 397-99.

The recent revival of interest in Trollope and the reasons for it.

Tupper, Hudson, Derek. "Martin Tupper." *N & Q*, Sept. 7, p. 105.

Hudson, Derek. "Martin Tupper." *TLS*, Feb. 16, p. 79.

Wadmore. W., L. M.; Jones, J. Fitzroy; Norris, J. A. "A poetic country curate." *N & Q*, Mar. 23, p. 122; Sept. 7, p. 109; Oct. 19, p. 173; Dec. 28, p. 285.

Concerning the Rev. H. R. Wadmore, who published a volume of poems in 1850.

Wilde (see also II, Wilson; III, Bentley). *The portable Oscar Wilde: selected and edited by Richard Aldington*. ("Viking portable library.") Viking. Pp. 690.

Rev. by Bergen Evans in *Book week*, Mar. 31, p. 10; in *New R*, Mar. 25, p. 422; by Carlos Baker in *NYTBR*, Mar. 24, p. 6.

Pearson, Hesketh. *The life of Oscar Wilde*. London: Methuen; New York: Harper. (American title: *Oscar Wilde: his life and wit*.)

Rev. by B. R. Redman in *Amer. merc.*, LXIII, 755; by Bergen Evans in *Book week*, July 21, p. 3; in *CE*, VIII, 50; by Richard Watts in *HTB*, July 21, p. 3; by George Freedley in *LJ*, LXXI,

976; by Eric Bentley in *New R*, Aug. 5, p. 148; by Raymond Mortimer in *NS*, July 13, p. 30; by Carlos Baker in *NYTBR*, July 21, pp. 3, 22; by W. J. Turner in *S*, June 28, pp. 664, 666; by Jean C. S. Wilson in *SRL*, July 20, pp. 7-8; in *TLS*, June 29, p. 304 (see also Oct. 26, p. 521, and Nov. 2, p. 535); by Horace Reynolds in *YR*, XXXVI, 361-62.

Roditi, Edouard. "Oscar Wilde's poetry as art history." *Poetry*, LXVII, 322-38.

Lively critical essay on synesthesia and Wilde's poems.—W. F.

Yeats (see also III, Bentley, Peacock; Dickens: Orwell). Jeffares, A. Norman. "W. B. Yeats and his methods of writing verse." *NC*, CXXXIX, 123-28.

Yeats, J. B. *Letters to his son, W. B. Yeats, and others, 1869-1922*. Ed. with a memoir by Joseph Hone; preface by Oliver Elton. New York: Dutton. Pp. 304. See VB 1944, 248.

Rev. by K. Rockwell in *Book week*, Oct. 20, p. 3; by P. Colum in *HTB*, Oct. 13, p. 3; by K. T. Willis in *LJ*, Oct. 1, p. 1330; by O. S. Gogarty in *NYTBR*, Oct. 20, p. 34.

BOOK REVIEWS

The British Museum Library: a short history and survey. By ARUNDELL ESDAILE. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., [1946]. Pp. 388.

Despite the inaccessibility of certain records because of the dislocations of war, Mr. Esdaile has been able to prepare an admirably complete and eminently readable survey of the history and growth, the failures and successes, the present greatness and future aims, of the library of the British Museum. With characteristic historical perspective, since he is writing of the development of a two-hundred-year-old institution, he makes only passing reference to the war just ended, and his brief comments on the first World War contrast the government's attempts to save money by reducing grants and closing reading-rooms with Germany's decision to keep all libraries operating without any curtailment. The librarian's view, it seems to be suggested, is so extensive that civilization's attempt to obliterate itself in war is merely a temporary inconvenience to the work of the library.

The British Museum has had its failures. Too many of its trustees have perhaps been chosen because they had titles instead of because they were intelligently bookish. Many members of its staff have been little, quarrelsome men, unaware of their great responsibility. For one hundred years it was unable to decide what its proper function should be, and it stumbled for many years over the problem of cataloguing. It failed to buy important books or collections constantly, sometimes for lack of money but often for mere lack of understanding. It has lagged far behind in the application of photography to the purposes of scholarship; indeed, Mr. Esdaile is almost condescending on page 343 in saying that microphotography "appears to have originally been the answer to a peculiarly American demand, that for complete, cheap and not bulky reproductions of whole files of newspapers." The experience of the past decade makes it abundantly clear that

such a function is only a fraction of the whole usefulness of photography.

But to make up for its occasional failures, the Museum has had abundant successes. In 1818 it bought Charles Burney's library, thus preserving Burney's unmatched collection of early newspapers. It has shown that the civil service can recruit many scholarly librarians, men in every generation who have made magnificent contributions in bibliography: Panizzi, Pollard, and Proctor, to name three under the letter *P*. The *Catalogue of XVth century books*, by Pollard and others, is a work of scholarly importance equaled by no other library publication in the world. The General Catalogue (1881-1904), prepared on lines laid down by Panizzi, although he himself planned only a catalogue in manuscript, is still the best single bibliographic guide to the literature of the Western world, far superior to the Catalogue of printed cards published by the Library of Congress. American students who have been trained to use the American dictionary catalogue are likely to be disappointed and confused, at first, when the British Museum's catalogue seems to be only an author catalogue; but it does include personal subjects and such invaluable headings as "England" and "France," and it is in many ways easier to use than the more extended cataloguing of the Library of Congress.

We have grown so accustomed to the concept of a great national library, even though the Library of Congress has been slow in accepting its own election to that position, that it is not entirely easy to understand why the British Museum was so slow in developing. But a brief survey of the foundation and growth of other major libraries will rescue the British Museum from scorn; all the old British university libraries, despite their privileged status, have fallen far behind, and no American library was genuinely great before the beginning of the present century. Harvard and the New York Public Library, which now

emulate the British Museum's desire for completeness, are still far short of equality, despite specialized superiorities; the Bibliothèque Nationale has fallen behind in the last century, and the Library of Congress has not yet attained the stature of Harvard or the British Museum. Perhaps the most disturbing weakness of the British Museum is in the literature of the eighteenth century. When the Museum was founded, the literature of the time was not deemed worthy of a collector's interest, and the Museum depended somewhat too much on the generosity of collectors; in recent years the Museum has been slow in filling those gaps, so that numerous American libraries are superior to it in one or another aspect of the eighteenth century.

The British Museum by aspiring to completeness has been able to avoid one major problem: What should not be kept? In the early days it sold many duplicates, duplicates that have enriched many American libraries and have therefore furthered the cause of scholarship. Despite occasional remorse at having parted with some item, the Museum has probably not retarded any scholarly work by selling those duplicates. But in recent years the Museum has allowed only a cautious "exchange" of books with dealers for better copies; I am not certain that this practice is not more dangerous than the cautious sale of duplicates, and I think most libraries find themselves encumbered with unwanted duplicates (mostly from miscellaneous gifts) that must be dismissed if the libraries are to survive. Possibly the British Museum is not so rigid in its practice as Mr. Esdaile suggests. The Museum maintains its completeness by never lending its books and by allowing no readers to consult the shelves directly; both rules are administratively attractive, but both rules ought probably to be abrogated occasionally. American and German libraries may have been too generous in lending books, but the best solution hardly seems to be statutory prohibition.

There is much about Mr. Esdaile's whole book to suggest his own membership in the British Museum's family. One comes upon countless remarks that could not have been made by a student from the outside. Perhaps

the most charming, completely unimportant and yet wonderfully revealing of the simplicity within the bleak walls in Bloomsbury and of the closeness of Mr. Esdaile's knowledge of the daily routine, is this on page 339: "Dusting is still done by hand in the main library; but a vacuum cleaner, especially intended for books, is in use in the Oriental Library."

A. T. HAZEN

University of Chicago

Problèmes et méthodes de la linguistique. By W. VON WARTBURG. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1946. Pp. vi+214.

The main purpose of this book is to illustrate by simple examples the process of linguistic change and to examine its nature by the comparative method. To this end the author has employed most successfully all the resources of modern linguistics—linguistic geography, psychology, and historical and descriptive grammar. His plan is based upon a simple Latin sentence, "*mater ancillae cultrum dedit*," and the French translation, "*la mère donna un couteau à la servante*." Here we are faced with questions of phonology, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, so that the whole field of linguistics is before us. While the matter is confined to Romance philology, the methods discussed are of interest to every linguist.

The extent to which the concept of phonetic law has been modified by the researches of Gillieron, based upon the *Atlas linguistique*, is well brought out in a discussion of Fr. *chat*, 'cat,' Fr. *chaise* (*chaire*) 'chair' ('pulpit'), and the importance of psychology is made clear. The desire to speak correctly, to say it as they say it in Paris, sometimes counteracts the sound-law and sometimes introduces a new form. The influence of the Church will protect a word against the sound-law if the word happens to be used in church (*chanter*, *chaire*). It is amusing to find the rooster called the 'vicar' in a dialect in which Lat. *gallus* would fall together with Lat. *cattus*, so that the cat and the rooster would have been confused. We are reminded that in the last analysis each word has its own history. Substratum and superstratum are considered. The author ad-

mits a Gaulish substratum in French and claims a great deal for a superstratum of Frankish influence.

There is an interesting chapter on the historical and the descriptive methods, in which Von Wartburg maintains that, while Saussure did a great service in distinguishing these disciplines, the objective of linguistics now is to combine them. This he proceeds most successfully to do, and in the course of his demonstration we are made aware of the limitations of the *Atlas linguistique*. While the map *riche* shows only this one word for the whole area of France, Von Wartburg claims eighty different words! For 'horse' the *Atlas* presents three words, but seventy have been recorded elsewhere!

The last two chapters are entitled, respectively, "Langue et parole" and "Langue et peuple"; but enough has been said to tempt anyone interested in the study of language.

This is a translation, by Pierre Maillard, of a German original, but the title, date, and place of publication of the German book are not mentioned. The translation is excellent. There is no index.

MYLES DILLON

University of Chicago

The letters and private papers of William Makepeace Thackeray. Collected and edited by GORDON N. RAY. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Rarely does a scholar have such a magnificent opportunity as the editor of these volumes secured for himself when he persuaded Thackeray's grandchildren that the time had come to disregard the request which Thackeray's daughter, Lady Ritchie, had interpreted as forbidding publication of his correspondence. Gradually, beginning about sixty years ago with some of the less fervent Brookfield epistles, the bars were let down, even Lady Ritchie including many extracts from letters in her editions of her father's works; but the material has been fragmentary and widely scattered. Now we have about sixteen hundred letters or parts of letters by Thackeray, three-fifths of them wholly unpublished hitherto, "while less than a fourth have appeared in their entirety" (I, lxxii); more than a hun-

dred letters by others, included as explanatory; and nearly a hundred and forty pages from diaries, mostly now first printed.

Yet even this accumulation is unfortunately incomplete. Because of the war the editor had to leave England before he could make much use of British sources other than those in the hands of Thackeray's granddaughter, Mrs. Fuller; and of many letters owned by Dr. Rosenbach he has been able to print only extracts or descriptions from sales catalogues. Already a supplementary volume "drawn from holdings in Great Britain" is promised (IV, vi), and many will regret that it did not seem feasible to defer publication until the work could be made as complete as is humanly possible.

Nevertheless, the value of what we have is very great, and the editor's huge undertaking has been admirably performed. Besides the material by Thackeray and his correspondents, there are "biographical memoranda" on the chief persons involved; many full-page portraits and facsimiles; countless reproductions of drawings with which Thackeray liked to ornament his letters; and copious notes to identify persons mentioned, provide background, and otherwise illuminate the material.

By far the greatest part of the correspondence, and the most interesting, was with women: his mother most of all; his daughters; Mrs. Brookfield and the Perry sisters, who were confidants in the *affaire* Brookfield; Mrs. Procter (wife of "Barry Cornwall") and her daughter Adelaide; Mrs. Baxter of New York and her two daughters. The only man with whom Thackeray corresponded at much length seems to have been Edward FitzGerald, and most of their letters were destroyed (I, cxxxiii). One by FitzGerald, however, previously unpublished, has some importance as showing that two translations from Béranger heretofore credited to Thackeray were, in fact, by FitzGerald (I, 330-41).

There is very little correspondence with other writers of the time, and still less that is new and important. A hitherto unpublished letter to Ainsworth (I, 326) indicates that Thackeray offered to make drawings for that author's *Crichton* not long after Dickens had

declined to accept a similar service for *Pickwick Papers*. There are, of course, many incidental comments on contemporary books and their authors; but most of Thackeray's remarks on such important figures as the Brownings, the Carlyles, Tennyson, Dickens, Bulwer-Lytton, and Charlotte Brontë, have already appeared somewhere.

Of his much-discussed and unduly sensationalized love for Mrs. Brookfield, the last words probably cannot be spoken until letters in Dr. Rosenbach's possession are published in full, though it seems likely that the most significant parts have appeared in the sales catalogues which Ray has used (Appen. XXVI). There can be no doubt of Thackeray's enduring devotion to the lady, but evidently there was no misconduct. These volumes contain practically nothing new on the little December-and-May romance with the pretty New York girl, Sally Baxter, whom Thackeray found astonishingly like Beatrix Esmond and whom he made to some extent a model for Ethel Newcome. There is a good deal of hitherto unpublished material about Mrs. Thackeray's insanity, and a psychiatrist's analysis based on this material constitutes Appendix VII.

In spite of the extent of the collection, there are some disappointing lacunae. Thus, though about the first half of Thackeray's short career at Cambridge is well covered by letters to his mother, there is an annoying leap in time from November, 1829, to July, 1830, and no light on the young man's abrupt departure from the university in June. Again, his sojourn in Germany from July, 1830, to March, 1831, is illuminated by letters to his mother; but the correspondence is disappointing for a long time after his admission to the Temple in June, 1831, while, like Pendennis, he was subordinating legal studies to efforts to win a place in literature or art.

It was to be hoped, for example, that new light would be cast on his beginnings with *Fraser's magazine*, which H. S. Gulliver (*Thackeray's literary apprenticeship*, chap. vi) and Miss Miriam Thrall (*Rebellious Fraser's*, pp. 55-80, 247-62) believe to have occurred in 1832. There is, indeed, evidence that he unsuccessfully offered verses to the magazine

as early as 1831 (I, 179-81), and his diary for 1832 records several meetings with William Maginn, virtually editor of *Fraser's*, and considerable enthusiasm about Maginn's ability and personal kindness; yet there is nothing definite about a *Fraser* connection until 1838—no evidence for or against Miss Thrall's contention that in the mid-thirties Thackeray collaborated extensively with Maginn.

There are, however, plenty of indications, many of them now first published, of relations with eight or nine newspapers, and as many magazines or reviews, during the years of struggle before he could say that "Vanity Fair may make me" (II, 258). This material has enabled Ray to identify as by Thackeray about forty articles, mostly in the *Morning chronicle*, not heretofore assigned to him (Appen. XII). The quantity, and it is fair to say also the quality, of such writing rouses wonder that the versatile youngster ever got to the work by which he made his chief fame.

Had the editor not set the precedent himself in the preface to Volume IV, I should hesitate to call attention to errata, mostly trivial, not easily avoidable in so complicated an undertaking, and perhaps due largely to his absence in the Navy while most of the work was seen through the press.

Even if the text accurately represents what was written, there are a few obvious blunders that might properly have been corrected in brackets.

II, 497: *Insert to after* go in line 16; 534, *substitute it for* is in line 8. III, 34: *Substitute than for that* in line 18; 40, same correction in line 13; 530, same in line 4. III, 186: *Should be children's instead of childrens'*; 314, *add r to you* in second line below the drawing; 636, *substitute or for of* in line 17. IV, 98: *Add d to please* in line 10 of note 49.

I notice two cases in which it is not indicated above a letter whether or not there has been previous publication: III, 377, to Milman; IV, 147, to Carlyle.

The following changes in numbers of letters referred to in footnotes are needed—II, 331, note 123: 408 *instead of* 407; 728, note 7: 294 *instead of* 293; 738, 751, and 754: references to *Times* controversy should all be to 743, *not* 742.

Some errors in the index (which, however, is extremely thorough) are: II, 190, a letter to

Longman not included; 785, a letter to Mr. Moffatt indexed as to Mrs. Moffatt. III, 431, a letter from Dickens indexed as to him; same error IV, 58. III, 441, a letter to Mr. Toulain indexed as to Mrs. Toulain. IV, 157, a letter from Carlyle indexed as to him; 169, from Milnes indexed as to him; 184, from Mrs. Browning indexed as to her; 206, from Trollope indexed as to him; 227, from Stephen indexed as to him.

Miscellaneous errata: I, lxviii, "Augustin [no final "e"] Daly"; II, 163: insert first before French in note 70. III, 411: was *instead of* were in note 137; 622: omit Alice in last line of note 130; IV, 22: substitute a comma for of in note 29; 232: rent-roll *instead of* rent-rolle in note 27; 279: 214 *instead of* 216 in note 50.

The plan of annotation explained in the introduction (I, lxxiv, lxxv) and well justified involved immense labor, and as a result the volumes make a rich mine for the student of Victorian days. It is to be regretted, but without surprise, that some further identifications and explanations could not be provided: notably of the person mentioned in the first paragraph of letter 169 (I, 452); the Perry of letters 239 and 251 (was he a brother of Mrs. Elliot and Kate Perry?); the connection, if any, of Edward Marlborough FitzGerald with Edward of the *Rubáiyát*; the identity of K—— in letter 357; and especially the meaning of "that fatal story about poor Isabella" (II, 237). In view of the editor's purpose referred to at the beginning of this paragraph, I offer the following memoranda as perhaps enriching, and in some cases correcting, his notes:

I, cvi.—It seems probable that Thackeray met Carlyle before 1837. Both appear in Maclise's drawing of "The Fraserians" in the January number of *Fraser's magazine* for 1835; both were contributors before that date and had probably met at the publisher's dinners.

I, 98.—By "the other two novels of Mr. Bulwer's" Thackeray must have meant *Pelham* and *The disowned*; the latter published as "by the author of *Pelham*," as was also *Devereux*. *Falkland* was comparatively unknown.

I, 191.—Though *DNB* gives 1793 as the year of Maginn's birth, notices of his death on August 21, 1842, say that he was "in his forty-ninth year"; and July 10 was his birthday. Hence the date was probably 1794 (see *Punch*, III, 98).

I, 270.—The "Standard" mentioned at the

end of letter 77 was doubtless the evening paper of which Maginn was coeditor (see n. 49, p. 197).

I, 327.—It would add interest to the note on Macrone to say that he was the publisher of *Sketches by Boz* and had other relations with Dickens. "Your friend Reynolds" must have been either Keats's correspondent, John Hamilton, or F. Mansel, son of the playwright, Frederick; more probably the latter. He had published a sensational novel, *Miserrimus*, in 1832 and had been editor of the *Keepsake*.

I, 351.—The paragraph relating to Maginn indicates that Thackeray was trying to secure payments on the loan he made to Maginn and reference to letter 1524 seems desirable.

I, 377.—Mrs. Jameson should not be called a "poetess"; her chief works were her valuable study of Shakspeare's heroines (*Characteristics of women*) and *Sacred and legendary art*.

I, 407.—The note on Reynolds repeats another error in *DNB*; he was born in 1794.

I, 513.—Note 3 as to Delane is inconsistent with the note on Barnes on page 375, and the latter is correct. "J. Delane" (John Thadeus) was still a student at Oxford in 1838 and did not join the staff of the *Times* until 1840. His father, W. F. A. Delane, however, was treasurer of the *Times* in 1838 (see *History of the Times*, 1785–1841 [1935], p. 446).

II, 24.—Heraud (n. 42) was never editor of the *New monthly magazine*; Theodore Hook was editor during the years mentioned. Thackeray was evidently right in naming the *Monthly magazine*, a different publication, of which Heraud was for a time editor (see *DNB*).

II, 29.—"Regina" was the Fraserians' "pet name" for their magazine, in imitation of "Maga" for *Blackwood's*.

II, 59.—*Bentley's miscellany* (not *magazine*) should be the title in note 40. "Boz" was its first editor and *Oliver Twist*, illustrated by George Cruikshank, its first great bid for popularity.

II, 143.—Thackeray's spelling of the name Venedey is correct; that of note 23 incorrect (as also in n. 65, p. 161). *Irlande* is the proper title of Venedey's book in question.

II, 229.—Examination of the reviews mentioned in note 10 justifies saying that the one on which Thackeray comments was in the *New monthly magazine*, of which Ainsworth was then editor.

II, 263.—A generation that has forgotten Mrs. Caroline Norton should be reminded that she was a granddaughter of Sheridan, gained considerable popularity as both poet and novelist, was involved innocently in a scandal with

Lord Melbourne, and that her career suggested Meredith's *Diana of the Crossways*.

II, 282.—Letter 382 presents a puzzle as to date, "25 February 1847," for there was no comment on Thackeray in the *North British review* until the May number for that year, when *Mrs. Perkins's ball* and *Vanity fair* were discussed (VII, 119-22).

II, 362.—For the reason suggested as to Mrs. Norton it seems desirable to add of Lady Blessington that her *Conversations with Lord Byron* is an important book and that she wrote several novels and books of travel that were popular.

II, 610.—"Heads of the People," which is not explained or indexed, was a work consisting of drawings by Kenny Meadows, "with original essays by distinguished writers," published in 1840 by Robert Tyas. Leigh Hunt, as well as Thackeray, was one of the "distinguished writers."

II, 691.—With relation to note 126 it seems possible that Thackeray was alluding to this passage in *Pendennis* ("Biographical ed.," p. 62): "It is best to love wisely, no doubt; but to love foolishly is better than not to be able to love at all."

II, 692.—At the top of page 686 there is mention of a plan to go to America nearly two months earlier than the one suggested in note 128.

II, 778.—The apparent discrepancy between the heading and the salutation suggests the need of a note explaining that Fanny Kemble Butler, sometime well-known actress, is addressed. There is confusion in the index (IV, 492, 526) as to this celebrated person.

II, 843.—"C 8" and "C 8½" are unexplained. May it be assumed that "C" means Camberwell, where, as stated in note 10 (p. 844), Mrs. Thackeray then lived?

II, 845.—A reader interested in learning how the correspondence eliminates "Elizabeth Brownrigg" from the Thackeray canon will be puzzled, because that title is not to be found in either index at the end of Volume IV.

III, 31.—It might be added to note 48 that Sir William Stirling-Maxwell married Mrs. Caroline Norton in 1877.

III, 265.—If letter 983 was to Robert Chambers, the Edinburgh author and publisher (as indexed), it would have been well to indicate the fact here.

III, 371.—And if letter 1051 was to Mrs. Peter Cunningham (as indexed), Peter might well have been identified as son of the better-known Allan, editor of Burns and author of many books.

IV, 51.—Read is best identified as author of "Sheridan's ride."

IV, 123.—The signature "Nicholas Cardinal" may be explained as probably a joke in allusion to a controversy of Lady Morgan with Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman in relation to St. Peter's chair (*Athenaeum*, January 4, 1851, pp. 7, 8).

IV, 209.—John Skelton (ultimately Sir John) wrote a great deal over the pseudonym "Shirley." The index confuses him (IV, 557) with an earlier John Henry Skelton, mentioned in note 30 (I, 348). There should be two index entries, and IV (not III), 216, 217, should follow Sir John's name.

IV, 252.—Letter 1524 seems to imply that Virtue had asked contribution to a monument for Maginn.

IV, 287.—The Charles Heath of letter 1567 cannot be the engraver of the index references on page 521 (as there implied), for the engraver died in 1848, as stated in I, 201, note 64.

IV, 307.—It seems probable that J. H. Reynolds, the friend of Keats, is meant in letter 1586. He and Barham and Thackeray were all members of the Garrick Club (which "smoking-room" suggests) and all contributors to *Bentley's miscellany* in 1837 and later.

IV, 321.—Dana was not editor of the *Tribune*, though for many years prior to starting his own *Sun* he was second in command to Greeley on the *Tribune*.

IV, 330.—Mrs. Hall was doubtless Anna Maria (Mrs. Samuel Carter, 1800-1881), author of Irish stories and other works and friend of many writers. It may be inferred that she offered for the *Cornhill* magazine an article on Mrs. Hemans, whom she had known.

IV, 368.—Presumably the Mrs. Trelawney mentioned was the wife of the friend of Byron and Shelley.

IV, 403.—It is not clear why Lady Shelley (n. 25) may not have been the wife of Sir Percy, the poet's son.

The foregoing additions and corrections, however, are but as "motes in the sunbeam." The value of the collection is very great; and in spite of handicaps the editor's task has been so well performed that we may look forward with eagerness to his promised biography of Thackeray.

GEORGE L. MARSH

University of Chicago

author of

Cardinal"

a allusion

Cardinal

Peter's

7, 8).

(Sir John)

Shirley."

an earlier

note 30

ries, and

Sir John's

ply that

onument

ter 1567

ferences

engraver

.

I. Reyn-

ter 1586.

members

g-room"

Bentley's

Tribune,

his own

eeley on

ss Anna

, author

riend of

e offered

on Mrs.

relawney

f Byron

Shelley

ir Percy,

rections,

ubeam."

r great;

r's task

ay look

romised

MARSH